FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-117
Monday
18 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-117 CONTENTS *18 June 1990*

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Status of Vienna Conventional Arms Talks Viewed *[Moscow International]* 1
'Considerable Progress' Seen in Conventional Arms *[TASS]* 1
U.S. Rejects Tactical Weapons Talks Proposal *[Moscow Radio]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov 15 June Briefing on World Issues 2
  On Bucharest Disorders *[TASS]* 2
  On Baltic Denuclearization Letter *[TASS]* 2
  On European Parliament Resolution *[TASS]* 2
  On Petrovskiy Meetings in Mideast *[TASS]* 3
'Slightly Veiled Diktat' Seen Regarding Germany *[Moscow Radio]* 3
Issues of German Unification Discussed *[Moscow Radio]* 3
NATO Not Responding to Warsaw Pact Changes *[London MORNING STAR 15 Jun]* 5
Issues of NATO, Bloc Transition Discussed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Jun]* 7
Recent Developments in East Europe Viewed *[Brutents in NEW TIMES No 22]* 8
Results of Summit's Outcome Considered *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* 11
Roundtable Discusses Major International Issues *[Editorial Report]* 13
Contradictory Reports View PRC-SRV Talks *[Moscow Radio]* 16
UNIDO Benefits Viewed By Delegation Chief *[Moscow TV]* 17

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Military Spokesman on U.S. Nuclear Tests *[TASS]* 18
U.S. Foreign Military Presence Questioned *[Zorin on Moscow International]* 18
Economic Conversion Discussed With U.S. *[TASS]* 18
'Top Priority' Program Discusses Summit *[Moscow International]* 19

China

Rogachev Comments on Bilateral Ties With PRC *[Moscow International]* 21
PRC Scientific, Technological Cooperation Viewed *[Moscow International]* 21

Northeast Asia

Security in Northeast Asia, Region Viewed *[Moscow International]* 22
Deputy Minister Meets New Japanese Ambassador *[Moscow International]* 22
Trade Ministers Conference Ends in Ulaanbaatar *[TASS]* 23

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sino-Soviet Talks on Cambodia Examined 23
  Nikolayev Commentary *[Moscow International]* 23
  Rogachev Expects More Talks *[Moscow International]* 23
Ferrous Metallurgy Protocol Signed with India *[TASS]* 24

Near East & South Asia

Prisoner of War Released in Afghanistan *[TASS]* ... 24
Circumstances of Il-76 Accident in Kabul Unknown *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* ... 24
KGB Official on Afghan Border Situation *[Moscow International]* ... 24
Iranian Opposition's Political Freedom Viewed *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* ... 25
Iran-Iraq Relations Seen as 'Fragile' *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* ... 26
Creation of Islamic Common Market Viewed *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* ... 26
Gorbachev Greets Israeli Communist Party Leaders *[TASS]* ... 27
UN Visit to Israel 'Designed To Calm Fears' *[Prokofyev on Radio Peace and Progress]* ... 27

East Europe

Tension Growing in Bucharest's University Square *[TASS]* ... 28
Romanian Ministry Criticized for Non-Action *[TASS]* ... 28
13-14 Jun Violence Spreads to Other Cities *[IZVESITYA 17 Jun]* ... 28
Bucharest 'Remains Tense' After 14 Jun 'Anarchy' *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* ... 29
Romanian Miners' Acts 'Reminiscent of Mass Terror' *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* ... 30
West's Sympathy With Bucharest Miners Cited *[Patsyuk on Moscow Radio]* ... 31
    Sympathy Termed 'Nonconstructive' *[TASS]* ... 31
    Western Response Criticized *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* ... 32
Hungary's Fragmented Socialist Party Surveyed *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* ... 32
Hungary Considers Withdrawal From Pact *[PRAVDA]* ... 33
    Fuer Sets Date for Late 1991 *[TASS]* ... 34
Troop Withdrawal From Hungary Poses Problems *[Moscow TV]* ... 34
Germany's NATO Membership Viewed Unacceptable *[East Berlin ADN]* ... 34

West Europe

Netherlands' Ter Beek Interviewed Prior to Visit *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]* ... 35

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuba's Viera Interviewed on Soviet Relations *[Moscow International]* ... 36

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Ends Session, Recesses *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* ... 38
Lukyanov Chairs Supreme Soviet Presidium Session *[Moscow TV]* ... 38
Results of Supreme Soviet Session Examined *[TASS]* ... 38
Lukyanov Speaks at News Conference 15 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* ... 39
Lukyanov Describes Conclusions of Session *[TASS]* ... 41
Gorbachev May Use Decrees To Enforce Laws *[AFP]* ... 41
Silayev Interviewed on Election, Program *[Moscow TV]* ... 42
Appeals to Republican Counterparts Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* ... 42
'Further Work' on Price Hike Decision Called *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* ... 42

Political & Social

Gorbachev Said To Be Recovering From Cold ... 43
    Lukyanov Makes Announcement *[AFP]* ... 43
    'Speedy Recovery' Wished *[ADN]* ... 43
Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress ... 43
    Pugo Chairs Preparatory Meeting *[TASS]* ... 43
    Commission Discusses Policies *[TASS]* ... 43
    Communists Seen as Divided *[TASS]* ... 45
    Girenko Views Upcoming Congresses *[TASS]* ... 45
CPSU Democratic Platform Conference Held ... 45
    Opens 16 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* ... 45

  - Views Russian Party, Baltics *[TASS]* 46
  - 'Various Trends' Emerge *[TASS]* 46
  - Urges Abandoning Communism *[TASS]* 47
- Parliament Appeals to Regions on Union, Market *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 47
- 'Consultations' To Precede Action on Prices *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 16 Jun]* 48
- Gorbachev Aide Maslennikov Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Jun]* 48
- Lukyanov Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Work *[Moscow TV]* 50
- Gorbachev Greets Scientific-Industrial Union *[TASS]* 54
- Gorbachev 'Ready for Cooperation' With Yeltsin *[London TV]* 55
- Ligachev, Yeltsin Clash at Peasant Union *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 55
- Miners' Congress Ends, New Union Discussed *[TASS]* 56
- Chernobyl Survivors' Congress Forms Union *[TASS]* 57
- Biryukova Examines Improving Living Standards *[UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA No 22]* 57

Economic

- Maslyukov Comments on Price Increases *[TASS]* 59
- Prices Chief Defends 'Phased' Market Switch *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 59
- Economy's Problems, Prospects Considered *[IZVESTIYA 7 Jun]* 62
- Resolution on Enactment of Pension Law Published *[TRUD 30 May]* 64
- Reportage on Paper Shortage, Newspaper Publication 67
  - Timber Minister Explains *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 8 Jun]* 67
  - PRAVDA Stops Reaching Subscribers *[PRAVDA 13 Jun]* 69
  - Press Circulation Criticized *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 70
- Defense Ministry Hands Over Precious Metals *[AFP]* 70

Scientific

- Development of 'Mir' Complex Detailed *[Moscow TV]* 70
- Cosmonauts Queried on Space Program *[Moscow TV]* 72
- Technological Testing Continues on 'Mir' *[TASS]* 73
- New Scientific-Industrial Union Holds Congress *[TASS]* 73

Military

- General Lobov on German Armies' Dissolution *[Hamburg DPA]* 73
- Frolov Chairs Discussion on Military Reform *[PRAVDA 18 Jun]* 74
- Yazov Speaks to Soviet Military Writers *[Moscow Radio]* 74
- Unilateral Troops Cuts Pledges Being Fulfilled *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* 77
- Chernavin Cited on N-Sub Dismantling Protest *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 77

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

- Baltic Assembly on Security, Independence Issues *[Moscow TV]* 79
  - Independence Freeze Opposed *[Tokyo TV]* 79
  - Warns Against 'Retreat' *[TASS]* 79
  - Landsbergis Addresses Assembly *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
- Lithuanian Communique on Independence 'Moratorium' *[Moscow TV]* 80
  - Rejection Likely *[Vilnius Radio]* 80
  - More on Moratorium *[AFP]* 80
  - 'Moratorium' Considered a Priority *[Vilnius Radio]* 81
  - Landsbergis Views Appeal *[Prague CTK]* 81
  - More on Lithuanian Stance *[Vilnius International]* 81
  - Sajudis Rejects Moratorium *[Vilnius Radio]* 82
  - Demonstration Planned *[Vilnius Radio]* 82
- Yeltsin, Council To Send Supplies to Lithuania *[Vilnius Radio]* 82
- Lithuanian Power Station Output Increased *[Vilnius Radio]* 82
- Gas Supply Resumes to Azotas Factory *[Vilnius Radio]* 82

- Vilnius Radio Carries 15 June Supreme Council ... 82
  - Landsbergis Speaks ... 82
  - Foreign Occupation Remembered ... 83
- Lithuanian Council Issues Appeals, Declarations ... 84
  - Appeals to UN *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 84
  - Appeals to Lithuanian People *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 85
  - Issues Declaration on Occupation *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 85
- Work of Lithuanian Party Plenum Reported *[Vilnius International]* ... 85
  - Adopts Nationalities Policy Program *[TASS]* ... 86
  - Urges Talks With Moscow *[Moscow TV]* ... 87
- Lithuanian Government Discusses Ties With Union *[Vilnius Radio]* ... 87
- Gorbunov Interviewed on Federation Council *[Maritime Service]* ... 87

RSFSR

- Reportage on 18 June Congress Proceedings ... 89
  - Agenda Reported *[TASS]* ... 89
  - Silayev Endorsed *[TASS]* ... 89
  - Silayev Outlines Program *[TASS]* ... 89
- Moscow TV Relays 17 June Congress Proceedings ... 90
  - Health, Refugee Matters Viewed ... 90
  - Local Problems Cited ... 91
  - General Debates ... 91
  - Deputies' Rights Considered ... 92
  - Procedural Matters Discussed ... 93
- Further Reportage on 17 June Congress Session ... 93
  - 'Priority Laws' Discussed *[TASS]* ... 93
  - Tatar Deputy Reads Appeal *[Moscow TV]* ... 94
  - Confrontation Continues *[TASS]* ... 95
- Moscow TV Relays 16 June Congress Proceedings ... 95
  - Chernobyl, Prices Viewed ... 95
  - Supreme Soviet Elections Debated ... 96
  - More on Elections ... 97
  - Isayev Speaks ... 97
  - Constitutional Changes Debated ... 98
  - Amendments Discussed ... 99
  - Isayev Answers Questions ... 100
  - Articles 6, 7 Debated ... 100
  - Control Committee Viewed ... 101
  - More on Control Committee ... 102
  - Election Results Reported ... 103
- Further Reportage on 16 Jun Congress Proceedings ... 104
  - Isayev Presents Report *[TASS]* ... 104
  - Constitution Amended *[TASS]* ... 104
  - Party's Leading Role Deleted *[TASS]* ... 104
- Russian Deputy Accuses CPSU of 'Genocide' *[Moscow TV]* ... 105
- Moscow TV Relays 15 Jun Supreme Soviet Session ... 105
  - Voting Procedures Debated ... 105
  - Premier Candidates Nominated ... 106
  - Bocharov Outlines Program ... 106
  - Silayev Explains Platform ... 107
  - Silayev Answers Questions ... 107
  - Deputies Debate Candidates ... 108
  - Debates Continue ... 109
  - Silayev Elected ... 110
  - State Arbiter Elected ... 110
- Council of Ministers Yields Power to Parliament *[Moscow Radio]* ... 111
- Silayev Elected RSFSR Council Chairman *[TASS]* ... 111
- TASS Reviews Silayev Election as Council Chair ... 111
- Further on 15 June Supreme Soviet Session *[Moscow Radio]* ... 112
- New Russian Prime Minister Meets Journalists *[TASS]* ... 112
- Gorbachev Chairs Russian Party Meeting *[TASS]* ... 113

Further on Moscow City CPSU Meeting *[TASS]* 113
Yeltsin Attends Leningrad Cathedral Service *[Moscow TV]* 113

Western Republics

Internal Troops Called at Ukraine Prison Riot 113
  Riots Begin 13-14 Jun *[TASS]* 113
  Hostages Held in Continuing Siege *[PRAVDA 15 Jun]* 114
  Talks With 1,000 Inmates *[Moscow TV]* 114
  Talks Continue With Inmates *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 114
Belorussia Opposes Use of Troops in Central Asia *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 114
Crimean Deputies Propose Restoration of Autonomy *[TASS]* 115
Ukrainian Republican Party Changes Rules *[Moscow Radio]* 115
New Association for Poles Started in Belorussia *[TASS]* 115

Caucasus

Azerbaijan Ensures Protection on Armenian Border *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Azerbaijan Declares 'Emergency' on Armenian Border *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 116
Georgian Ministry Urges National Military Units *[Moscow TV]* 116
Kirghiz Communist Party Reports on Congress *[Moscow Radio]* 116
Azerbaijan Thought Defaulting on NKAO Decision *[ARMENPRES]* 116
Yerevan Criticizes Azerbaijan About Candidates *[ARMENPRES]* 117
New Youth Organization Established in Georgia *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Apathy Delays Armenian Parliament's Formation *[IZVESTIYA 2 Jun]* 118
Agro-Industrial Backwardness Examined in Baku *[Baku Radio]* 118

Central Asia

Continued Reportage on Violence in Kirghizia 119
  Journalist Describes Situation *[Moscow Tv]* 119
  Unrest Dominates Kirghiz Congress *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 119
Kirghiz Writer Discusses Language Issue, Uzbeks *[Frunze Radio]* 120
Kazakh Quake Not Caused by Semipalatinsk Tests *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* 120
Kazakh Congress Addressed by Party Leaders *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 120
New Electronics Plant Starts Up in Turkmenistan *[Moscow TV]* 120
Uzbek Party Congress Convened in Tashkent *[Baku Radio]* 121
Uzbek Supervisory, Auditing Commission Meets *[Tashkent Radio]* 121
Uzbek, Kazakh Presidents Affirm Friendship Ties *[TASS]* 121
  Need for 'Commonwealth' Seen *[Moscow TV]* 121

Status of Vienna Conventional Arms Talks Viewed

OW1706054190 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 1400 GMT 10 Jun 90

[Text] Dear listeners: Is Moscow holding up the progress of the Vienna talks on conventional arms in Europe? The West has been putting the blame on the USSR. General Moiseyev, chief of staff of the Soviet Armed Forces, made the following statement on this:

Member countries of the Warsaw Pact, including the USSR, neither wish to stop nor delay the Vienna talks. We are, in fact, very concerned about its progress. Press reports are sometimes not very accurate. Some member countries of the Warsaw Pact lack self-confidence, this is true. This was borne out in a meeting between the leaders of the Warsaw Pact General Staff Headquarters and its General Command in Moscow on 1 and 2 June. Member countries of the Warsaw Pact and NATO have a common stand on a concrete contribution to talks on questions concerning the destruction of weapons and the reduction of troops. Relevant documents have been signed in this regard.

Today, in considering the situation in Europe, some countries attempt to relinquish their obligations under the Pact and retain more equipment and weapons for themselves. Here we are referring to the GDR. A GDR spokesman once said if the republic joins NATO after German unification, then the proportion of the GDR's contribution to the destruction of equipment and weapons is to be determined by other member countries of the Warsaw Pact. As everyone knows, this is a very difficult problem, but I think we can find the right solution.

General Moiseyev added: we will fulfill our obligations and strive to end the Vienna talks this year.

'Considerable Progress' Seen in Conventional Arms

LD1506205190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1405 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS military affairs observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—In spite of the pessimistic forecasts of certain political observers who have been claiming that "Moscow has lost interest in the talks on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe," considerable progress has been achieved in Vienna of late, opening the way for formulating the provisions of the future treaty in the part relating to reductions in the tanks and armored vehicles of the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries. All that remains for the sides to do in this area is to agree to certain details connected with the weaponry of armored vehicles and their combat designation.

The road to reaching a compromise was not easy. For almost a year the participants in the Vienna talks held discussions on a number of complex technical problems linked to armored vehicles. Often the technical difficulties were complicated by military and political factors. For example, certain countries in the West attempted to place their light tanks right outside the framework of the cuts. Differences of opinion arose for a long time between the sides over the criteria for classifying the tanks and armored vehicles liable to be cut. Even the question of how to assess the weight of armored vehicles, with or without fuel, proved complicated.

Now the main differences of opinion over tanks and armored vehicles have finally been removed. A maximum permissible number of tanks—20,000—is being established for each of the two alliances, the Warsaw Pact and NATO. All tracked and wheeled tanks weighing more than 16.5 tons (without fuel) fall within this category. All armored vehicles weighing less than 16.5 tons are considered armored vehicles which are in turn divided into infantry fighting vehicles (IFV), armored personnel carriers (APC), and armored vehicles with heavy weapons. Both NATO and the Warsaw Pact have the right to have no more than 30,000 armored vehicles, to include no more than 18,000 IFV's and no more than 1,500 armored vehicles with heavy weapons.

The progress made at the Vienna talks is an important practical result of the recent Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. As is well known, the Soviet and U.S. presidents instructed their delegations to step up the pace of the Vienna talks and reach agreements on all unsolved matters without delay. These obligations were upheld by the Warsaw Pact and NATO countries. The agreement in Vienna on the sides' positions on armored vehicles lifts the barriers on the way to achieving mutually acceptable solutions on verification procedures [po protseduram proverki], the exchange of data on the armed forces, and the procedure for eliminating the equipment being reduced.

The most important thing is that the successful conclusion of the discussions on armored vehicles will create a promising precedent for an agreement in Vienna on technical aircraft, and this will enable fulfillment of the obligation of the sides to draft a treaty on conventional forces in Europe for signing by the end of this year.

U.S. Rejects Tactical Weapons Talks Proposal

LD1606172790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] The United States has turned down the Soviet proposal to start talks on the elimination of tactical nuclear weapons in Europe this fall. Marlin Fitzwater, a representative of the White House, has in effect explained the NATO position whereby such talks must be held only after the achievement of an agreement on the reduction of conventional armaments in the European Continent.

Gerasimov 15 June Briefing on World Issues

On Bucharest Disorders

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Yuriy Rublevskiy]

LD1506151190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1437 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—Speaking at a briefing here, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Administration, citing media reports, stated that on 13 and 14 June disorders took place in Bucharest, resulting in a number of casualties. They took place immediately after the parliamentary and presidential elections which laid the foundations for the formation of legal and democratic institutions in Romania.

The Soviet diplomat remarked that Romania faces many difficulties. They are connected with the objective conditions of the transfer from the authoritarian regime to a genuinely law-based state, to which no smooth, beaten track exists. "It is all the more obvious that the advent of new complications in the domestic political life of the country could merely drive it to dramatic trials," he pointed out.

"However, reports are now arriving that the situation in Bucharest is returning to normal, Gennadiy Gerasimov emphasized. We hope that stability and the on-going implementation of democratic transformations will be ensured."

On Baltic Denuclearization Letter

LD1506163890 Moscow TASS in English 1622 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, in a letter sent on April 28, 1990 to the foreign ministers of Britain, France, the United States, West Germany, Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic, dwelt on the issue of denuclearising the Baltic Sea.

The contents of the letter were revealed by Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov at a briefing here today.

The letter was motivated by the Soviet Union's quest to step up joint efforts in this area, in view of northern Europe's immense stabilising importance for the entire European process and the popular desire to turn these countries into a firm element of the all-European and worldwide security system.

The letter also said that the transformation of the Baltic into a nuclear-free zone is possible "only through multilateral talks with states in the Baltic as well as with nuclear weapons states using its waters".

The Soviet Union believes that the aim of such talks should be the complete removal of all nuclear weapons from the Baltic Sea.

This would mean a ban on the deployment of such weapons on ships and aircraft, a total ban on the passage of ships carrying nuclear weapons from non-littoral states and the flights of their planes with such weapons above the sea, and non-deployment of nuclear weapons on and under the Baltic Sea-bed, including the territorial and internal waters of the littoral nations.

The minister suggested that the nuclear weapons states pledge not to send their vessels or aircraft with nuclear weapons on board to the Baltic Sea and agree to establish control over the absence of nuclear weapons on board their ships entering the Baltic.

Shevardnadze recalled that the USSR unilaterally began the elimination of certain categories of sea-based nuclear weapons in the Baltic.

As a first step, the Soviet Union withdrew from its Baltic fleet four Golf-class submarines and will eliminate two remaining vessels of this type before the year's end.

The minister's letter said that the USSR intends to announce its unilateral decision not to deploy nuclear weapons on its ships and aircraft within the Baltic Sea area and airspace in peace-time and not to deploy nuclear weapons on and under its sea-bed within its territorial and internal waters.

On European Parliament Resolution

LD1506164790 Moscow TASS in English 1624 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow TASS June 15—The European Parliament, during its session in Strasbourg on Thursday, adopted a resolution urging Israel to end the settlement of immigrants on the occupied Arab territories, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

The resolution, he noted, blasted Israel's repressive actions against Palestinians and violations of human rights both in Israel and on the occupied territories.

The European Parliament supported the idea of sending an international fact-finding commission to the occupied territories to prepare a report on the use of U.N. peace forces in the region. It stressed the right of Palestinians to self-determination and the creation of an independent state.

The European Parliament resolution, the Soviet spokesman said, calls for the immediate convocation of a meeting of the five permanent members of the U.N. Security Council to discuss the peace process and prepare an international conference on the Middle East. It also contains a call on all European community member-countries to consider and take steps to pressure the Israeli Government to respect the rights of Palestinians.

"In the Soviet Union," Gerasimov stressed, "this stance of the European Parliament is viewed with satisfaction. It is close to the Soviet approach to the key issues of the Middle East solution. The resolution strengthens the political base for interaction between the Soviet Union and the European community in the interests of consolidating stability and consolidating peace in the Middle East."

On Petrovskiy Meetings in Mideast

LD1506172990 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Igor Peskov and Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—"The Middle East basically remains a 'blank spot' on a map marking the solution of regional conflicts," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov told a briefing here today.

But the Soviet Union remains committed to finding a solution that would suit all parties involved, he said.

During meetings with Iraqi President Saddam Husayn and Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz, PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat and King Husayn of Jordan, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy discussed ways to restructure the region by peaceful means and possibilities of a political settlement, including by using the full potential of the United Nations.

The understanding that immediate actions and broad approaches are required to resolve the conflict is growing in the Middle East, Gerasimov said.

"What is particularly important today is to nourish the sprouts of trust bursting their way through layers of contradictions, and overcome confrontation," he emphasised.

The Iran-Iraq settlement was discussed during Petrovskiy's meetings, Gerasimov said. The USSR indicated its readiness to consider the possible holding of a bilateral Iran-Iraq meeting on its territory.

'Slightly Veiled Diktat' Seen Regarding Germany

LD1706125490 Moscow World Service in English 1110 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The German issue, particularly the outer aspects of the consequences of German unification, is undoubtedly the focus of attention at talks on different levels. [passage outlining discussions scheduled]

According to our commentator Aleksandr Pogodin there are two reasons for this close attention to the problem. The first is its crucial importance for the destiny of Europe and the world as a whole. The second reason is that the attitudes to the problem differ greatly, even more than approaches to disarmament or other major world issues. Aleksandr Pogodin draws attention to a trend visible in the statements of some NATO leaders. Its essence is that the issue of a unified Germany's participation in NATO has already been decided, and so the role of the two-plus-four conferences should be confined to a legal renunciation of their commitments by the victor countries involved in the anti-Hitler coalition. True, all this is accompanied by assurances that the Soviet Union's interests will be duly taken into account.

Frankly speaking, writes Aleksandr Pogodin, all this is reminiscent of a slightly veiled diktat, an attempt to press a unilateral version on the other side. Such development of events would be extremely dangerous. It should be realized that if the USSR gets the impression that it is not reckoned with as far as the German question is concerned, positive changes in Europe will be seriously jeopardized. The main thing now is to jointly find, discriminating against no one, such a solution to the German issue that would be conducive to strengthening trust, not destroying what has already been gained.

This process will be neither simple nor fast. Evidently, time and patience will be required. As for the Soviet Union, it recognizes the right to equal security for all, of course, but at the same time will steadily uphold the interests of its own security, says Aleksandr Pogodin in conclusion.

Issues of German Unification Discussed

LD1606143390 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 15 Jun 90

["Top Priority" program presented by Maksim Tkachenko, with Christian Schmidt-Haeuer, Moscow correspondent of DIE ZEIT, and Sergey Plekhanov, deputy director of the Institute of the United States and Canada]

[Excerpts] [Trachenko] Hello everybody and welcome to "Top Priority," a weekly Radio Moscow panel discussion on major world events. I am Maksim Tkachenko hosting this week's edition of the program. Our guests today are Christian Schmidt-Haeuer, Moscow correspondent of the West German Newspaper DIE WELT, and Sergey Plekhanov, deputy director of the Moscow-based research Institute of the United States and Canada. And today's topic of discussion is German unification, more specifically the future military and political status of a unified Germany. There have been a lot of diplomatic efforts recently to solve this issue as world leaders met each other and made some political stements. On Tuesday President Gorabchev, in a report to the Soviet national legislature, Supreme Soviet, on his Washington summit with President Bush, proposed a unified Germany with dual associate membership of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. NATO leaders were quick to reject this idea, reciprocating that it should be a full-fledged member of NATO. It seems as though no breakthrough is in sight so far between the Soviet Union and the Western countries on this issue.

I'd like to start by asking you, Dr. Plekhanov. All Western as well as many East European countries, including Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, wish to have Germany in NATO. The Soviet Union is almost alone in opposing that. Why is it so?

[Plekhanov] Well, it's a complicated question. As far as the West is concerned I think that the trend is to have something more or less stable to rely upon in an age of great uncertainty. NATO is there. When you talk to Western experts on the subject they say: well, NATO is one organization in Europe that really works. They omit to mention of course that NATO has worked in the sense of opposing the Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union. NATO was created as a bloc against the Soviet Union and to the extent that it has worked it has worked as the tool of containing the Soviet Union. But I would like to emphasize that there is this grasping at something that exists, something that is supposed to work, in the age of great uncertainty about the way European politics will go.

As far as American interests are concerned, there is another consideration: that is the fact that the United States is concerned about its waning influence in Europe and NATO is one military-political tool of prolonging American influence in Europe, especially against the prospect for European unification which raises concerns in Washington as to what the American opposition will be.

As far as East European countries are concerned, I think here the considerations are more complex. In a number of those countries we have seen the emergence of governments which are clearly tilting towards the West and want to be nice to the West, and they do not see any danger to them from NATO. They would like to get out of this conflict between the two blocs. In addition there is, I think, they are inclined to go along with the oft-repeated position that all Europeans will be safer if Germany is anchored in NATO. I think that there is some merit to this position but it goes unanswered too much in the debates. I think that the position is questionable and I think that to continue to treat Germans as a nation which needs to be policed around in one way or another is a reflection of obsolete assumptions about Germany. [passage omitted: Schmidt-Haeuer says Germany is more concerned with economic than with military matters and wants to see the USSR looking for solution of the economic security of Europe as the military question is already solved.

[Tkachenko] Let me ask this one, Dr. Plekhanov: The West maintains a, let me say, rigid position on Germany in NATO and shows no readiness to compromise that, whereas the Soviet Union proposes different kinds of solutions from a neutral Germany to Germany as dual associate member of both military alliances. Do you think that the West might add pressure upon the Soviet Union eventually to make the Soviet Union accept its approach in face of the economic problems of the Soviet Union and some analysts, for example, say that the USSR has to prepare itself to swallow the idea of Germany in NATO, which is inevitable?

[Plekhanov] First of all, I don't think that the Western position is grounded in concrete. I think that it has been shifting. I think there has been some movement forward during the summit, or after the summit. I hope that during the NATO meeting....

[Tkachenko] You mean the Baker nine-point plan?

[Plekhanov] Yes, the nine-point plan is a step forward. There is a recognition—and that is more important than any particular formula—there is a growing recognition in Washington and other Western capitals that the Soviet Union should not be left bruised and offended by the way the new European security structure is built. When Gorbachev cites a fact that a lot of people in the Soviet Union have great concerns about a unified Germany in NATO, he is talking about a political reality and that reality has to be taken into account, because if we are forced to swallow something then we might also vomit, you know, and if we vomit it will not be good, and not only for us but everybody. So one should be very very careful about not increasing the insecurity of the Soviet Union on this particular question. So there is a need for movement forward on both sides, for sorts of compromises. Again I do not rule out the possibility of such an arrangement of a Germany in NATO formula that would be satisfactory to the Soviet Union, but we think that a pan-European security system would be a very good arrangement where each country would be anchored in a way in the sense that we would all have mutual responsibilities about our individual and collective security. What worries people about united Germany in NATO formula is that you have here the augmenting of a military-political pact, NATO, at the expense of the Soviet Union at a time when East and West are supposed to be mending their fences and doing away with the cold war structure. So it does go against the grain because it perpetuates one of the cold war structures in Europe. [passage omitted: Schmidt-Haeuer says the approach from a united Germany cannot be foreseen but Germany will certainly not be interested in arming because the time of armaments is gone and today power in world politics is assessed in economic terms]

[Tkachenko] A question to both of you gentlemen. For a long time the four allies in the World War II shared responsibility in decision-making on Germany's future, and we now increasingly more often hear that after all the Germans themselves should have a decisive say in shaping their future. In fact, President Bush recently mentioned the possibility of signing off the powers of the four allies over Germany in the near future. What do you think of that?

[Plekhanov] Well, I think ultimately of course the four powers will have to relinquish their special rights in this area. The way to do it could be the signing of a peace treaty with Germany, something which has not been done. There are other formulas offered. But for the time being I think this transitional mechanism can be used in order to promote a satisfactory evolutionary settlement of the problem. So I would not go along with this idea of let's forget about the four nations' responsibilities, let the Germans decide their own fate. I think it's a contradictory posture. On the one hand the Germans are supposed not to be able to go about their own foreign affairs and therefore they need to be anchored in NATO. On the other hand the Germans are supposed to be able to decide their own future. I think it's a short term and rather opportunistic approach on the part of the West.

[Schmidt-Haeuer] Well, my position is that, first, I think a peace treaty is not possible. That is a position which Germany will not accept.

[Tkachenko] Why?

[Schmidt-Haeuer] Well, because there is a lot of other questions, reparations, and all these questions are coming high. And in a certain sense, let me say, the German fascism was the biggest crime in this century, but what the Germand did afterwards in the last 40 years I think it is enough to demonstrate to the world that they will try the best not to come back to such a hsitory. And so in a certain sense the peace treaty, from the (?psychological) approach, well, this brings again the idea of a defeated nation getting the treaty and so there could be, I think, an announcement or declaration but not a real peace treaty. The second thing is that Germany is a country now which has very complicated relationship to the neighbors and, in a certain sense, because everybody—and your are right, Mr. Plekhanov, when you say that there are certain objections against the way how (?best) Germany would develop as a superpower in the economic sphere. Well, to give them a treaty [words indistinct] that could again bring the idea that Germany is a little bit, you know, fenced in. So in that sense I am against a peace treaty. As far as the future of, well, the possibility of security from Germany is concerned, I think it would be maybe better to think whether Germany itself couldn't give the Soviet Union explanations, announcements, unilateral declarations, let me say: we will never have A-B-C weapons; we will reduce the Bundeswehr, the German Army, to, let me say, half of the level of today. We will guarantee that the part of the GDR—until now it is a part—the GDR which will then be the eastern part of Germany, that there will be no—that this will not be the territory where the NATO can act, guaranteed for the Soviet troops beyond the next years. So I think, my idea is that it is better to expect all these things from Germany itself in a bilateral position to the Soviet Union than to do it in some big power agreement because I think there is one main factor which we must see: Germany is prepared and, from the historical and traditional approach, interested to have very good contacts to the Soviet Union as far as the economic questions are concerned. And the Soviet Union is, (?after) my impression now, well, it's forced to have excellent economic relations with Western Germany because we are real...in that in sense we are neighbors and in that sense there is a real understanding in West Germany and in Germany at all [as heard], the forthcoming Germany, for a special situation of the Soviet Union on the economic sphere. There is much more understanding that you have in America or in Great Britain. So this is the idea where we have to go, for my [word indistinct]

[Plekhanov] I think it's a very important point that much depends on what the West German government or the future united German government will do and say, because so far as we have seen too much delegation of the West German position to....

[Tkachenko] That's right.

[Plekhanov] Washington, and let Washington speak for a united Germany.

[Tkachenko] Absolutely right (?now).

[Plekhanov] At the same time there has been an ambivalence in the Germans. I understand that there is a strong nationalistic streak in West German politics and in East Germany now, too. And I understand that some West German politicians are playing upon that streak. And I see a kind of a hidden psychological pleasure that some nationalists in Germany derive from the idea that Soviet troops will finally be evicted from Germany which would be a kind of compensation for the defeat of 1945. You say that psychologically a peace treaty would remind the Germans that they lost World War II. But I think there is also this notion that by driving the Soviet Union out of Germany and out of Eastern Europe, the Germans would kind of make up for the trauma of the defeat of 1945. It's not good politics, I mean it's not healthy, but I understand that, you know, for some politicians this is as good as any other slogan. Just as for some politicians in the Soviet Union fanning up the German danger is considered good politics, even though on merit it is not good politics. [passage omitted: Schmidt-Haeuer believes the German population has a very strong feeling to help the USSR, while the West German Government's internal politics of going straight ahead with unification are power politics against other parties]

NATO Not Responding to Warsaw Pact Changes

PM1506151090 London MORNING STAR in English 15 Jun 90 pp 4-5

[Interview with CPSU Central Committee Secretary Oleg Baklanov by Vladimit Ostrovskiy: "When Applause Is Not Enough"]

[Text] [Ostrovskiy] Are you satisfied with the way Soviet foregin policy decisions are being implemented in the world arena?

[Baklanov] I am worried that some of our foreign policy initiatives may be running too far ahead. They are correct, but as applied to the existing world situation they are premature.

I think we sometimes regard our own correct ideas as having been already achieved. They are indeed novel, but not always reciprocated by our partners in the West.

The new political thinking that we have offered the world will not itself enter others' minds, including certain political leaders. And although no one directly rejects it and although we were even applauded in many Western countries, far from everything that we have offered has found a positive response, especially in the Atlantic alliance, NATO.

True, most people in the world welcome sincerely the shedding of ideological blinkers in our society. Saying goodbye to the "enemy image" that has for decades fed mutual suspicion is meeting the wishes of people around the world.

Civilisation, perhaps for the first time, sees ways of changing the world fundamentally; of turning the chance to survive into one of progress for all humanity. Quite understandably, this raises people's hopes.

But our course—from mutual understanding via cooperation to joint action—has already run up against diplomatically erected barriers.

The West is adept at creating sponge-like walls which absorb all valuable and bold initiatives. This is to be regretted. There is a historical and a strategic explanation for that.

But, in fact, the Warsaw Treaty is radically changing its nature. It is becoming a political rather than a military organisation.

Some Western papers describe this as its collapse. They take as their starting point the declaration adopted recently in Moscow.

The declaration leaves no doubt that those who attended the political consultative committee's session—top representatives of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation's member countries—are in favour of a new European security system, for a single Europe of peace and cooperation.

And what is so remarkable about it?

From Scotland, where the NATO Council met a few days ago, we also heard many Western political leaders, including the British premier Margaret Thatcher, but none of them made specific proposals in reply.

True, they had kind words about us. But as you may remember, such words about Moscow were uttered in the West earlier, too. The West readily encouraged us to take unilateral steps in disarmament and reduction of our troops.

In the meantime they took steps to strengthen their military alliance, sticking to old doctrinal and political positions.

In short, our Western partners would like to proceed only from conditions favourable to them.

They recognise our worries and interests only in words, without making any specific moves in their foreign policy and arms control.

In this connection I would like to note that there are people in the Soviet Union who think that if the Soviet Union disarms itself unilaterally, NATO, moved to the bottom of its heart by such a step, would disband itself in reply.

That is a deep delusion.

[Ostrovskiy] Allow me to ask you about the prospects for European security structures in this context: do you belong to those who reject such an option? Perhaps you think that what the declaration says about confrontational elements in past documents of the Warsaw Pact is premature, and that NATO is out of step with the spirit of the times?

The East European countries proposed to NATO that they should co-operate in a constructive way for European stability and disarmament, promoting confidence and asserting the principle of defence sufficiency.

Can the West evade these proposals in the current situation in the world?

[Baklanov] I do admit the possibility of such developments although I do not preclude that NATO can evade making radical steps in reply. At the same time I am convinced that new European security structures will become a reality. Humanity simply has no other way.

But I would like to warn you against going to extremes, against acting like a wood-grouse which hears only itself and not the hunter. Such a position is fraught with frustration, if no more.

The Warsaw pact member-countries have embarked on a real transformation of their alliance into a political one, while our Western partners are only proclaiming their intentions while remaining in the same positions.

No-one in NATO has dropped the strategy of forward line defence, flexible response, nuclear arms modernisation, and there are the plans to build up NATO by incorporating a unified Germany into it.

Seen in this way, present positions do not offer adequate approaches, nor hopes for mutual trust, which we would like to see established in relations between states.

Mind you, mistrust comes from NATO, not from us. We are withdrawing troops from central Europe, and cutting them down unilaterally. In brief, we are leaving, while NATO is staying put and, as far as I can judge, becoming stronger.

[Ostrovskiy] Despite a statement at the NATO Council's session in Scotland that the alliance was extending the hand of friendship and co-operation, the US plans to site new air-to-surface nuclear missiles with an enhanced range in Britain, West Germany, Italy, Belgium and other NATO countries.

Plans are co-ordinated to deploy nuclear cruise missiles on ships and submarines to hit ground targets by NATO naval forces.

It is not accidental that the US is refusing to talk with us on reducing naval forces and eliminating sea-based tactical nuclear weapons. This is to its disadvantage.

The fact is that the US naval forces have seven times more air-capable ships and aircraft carriers and more than 10 times more ships with cruise missiles.

Given such a ratio, can we expect NATO chiefs of staff and political leaders of NATO countries to make a fundamental change in the activities of the alliance?

[Baklanov] I am not going to make an inventory of NATO decisions, as we would not see the wood for the trees. But the trend is clear enough.

I think we should pause, look around and see what kind of balance of forces is now emerging in Europe.

So far it is not favouring parity. On the contrary, everything points to the fact that it won't be us who will upset the balance.

By all appearances, including the most self-evident ones, NATO is taking advantage of the new situation on the continent.

A disbalance of forces is developing. I recall President Gorbachev's recent statement that it is necessary to decide what to do with the Vienna disarmament process; whether it should be continued or not.

And if it is to be continued, should this be done on the same principles and with the same approaches as today, or on some other? That is logical, if real politics is meant. And I fully share his stand. It is realistic.

Issues of NATO, Bloc Transition Discussed

PM1506134190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Article by observer Vasiliy Pustov under the rubric "World Today: Problems and Opinions": "Difficult Transitional Period"]

[Text] The foreign ministers of the NATO countries adopted a truly unusual document when they assembled for a NATO council session in the small Scottish town of Turnberry. "We extend to the Soviet Union and all other European states a hand of friendship and cooperation"—these were the words with which they began their final communique.

Not unskeptical observers may object: but surely in the past there have been assurances from the NATO leadership of a favorable attitude toward the Warsaw Pact states? Yes, there have been. But they sounded ambiguous, to put it mildly. But now the ministers are for the first time, unless memory fails me, giving a frank and precise explanation of their friendly tone toward the USSR and its allies. Responding to the Warsaw Pact states' declaration adopted at the 7 June conference of the Political Consultative Committee, they wrote: "We are inspired by the positive spirit contained in this declaration and in particular by the readiness for constructive cooperation."

Indeed, the short Political Consultative Committee Declaration concentrates constructive initiatives aimed at the further normalization of the situation in Europe. In the present difficult transitional period connected with the processes taking place on the continent and with the creation of an all-European system of security, the Warsaw Pact states are reviewing not verbally but in deeds the nature, functions, and activity of their alliance in order to make a substantial contribution to the consolidation of peace, security, and stability. For this they affirm their readiness to collaborate constructively with NATO and its members and with the continent's neutral and nonaligned states on a bilateral and multilateral basis.

These are very important provisions. They have prompted the NATO countries' ministers to adopt a number of premises which in my view are to a certain extent in keeping with the positive changes taking place on our continent. The ministers welcome broad dialogue between the leaders of the countries belonging to the opposing blocs and promise "to develop to a greater degree contacts between the military and exchange on military questions" and to continue "to build up the contribution to the matter of confidence building, taking as the point of departure a seminar on military doctrines" held, as is well known, at the Soviet initiative. The readiness was voiced during the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe to consider the interests of the other side and to embark on sensible compromises with a view to reaching mutually acceptable solutions.

Such in brief is the content which, to stick to NATO's metaphor, the ministers placed in the hand extended to the Soviet Union and its allies. But NATO also has another hand—a hand which is not stretched out, and what it clutches is also very important to us. And the difference between these hands undoubtedly reflects the contradictory nature of NATO's stance on a number of very important international problems and the bloc's approach toward safeguarding security.

I shall begin with the problem of Germany's unification. The external aspects of this process, as is well known, are closely linked with many questions of vital importance both for us and for all other peoples of Europe. It looks as though NATO has been "constantly recycling" the idea of a united Germany's membership of this union, although the final communique speaks of the intention to consider the Soviet Union's legitimate interests.

Of course, a recognition of realities can be heard not only in the communique but also in the speeches of many responsible politicians in the West. A growing understanding of our arguments and concern is emerging. But we cannot fail to note that so far no solution which would satisfy both sides has been found to this complex problem.

The Soviet position was set forth once again very clearly by President M.S. Gorbachev when he addressed the USSR Supreme Soviet 12 June. It proceeds from the premise that decisions be jointly found for the German problem—decisions which would fit into the overall positive tendency of the changes in Europe and the world, strengthening security without shaking or reducing it. I think that Soviet people cannot fail to be satisfied by the USSR President's assurance that during further meetings and talks, "while displaying the necessary flexibility, considering the interests of all states involved, and recognizing the right to equal security for all, we shall unswervingly defend the interests of our own country's security."

But in this light is it possible to say that the participants in the Turnberry session used the historical chance of creating a Europe without blocs, as the Warsaw Pact suggests, of demilitarizing it and turning it into a nuclear-free zone? Unfortunately not.

So far NATO's adherence to the stereotypes of the past can be seen. The eulogies to NATO sound like "a guarantee of its members' security." As before, with reference to the fact that the Soviet Union retains a considerable military potential (which, incidentally, the USSR does not deny because the United States, for instance, has a potential no smaller), the need is propagandized for NATO to combine conventional and nuclear forces, particularly U.S. forces, as the "decisive factor" for preserving peace in Europe. Is it not true that all this is like a manifestation of residual adherence to the pernicious strong-arm policy of "cold war" times?

But NATO cannot fail to take account of the requirements of the time. That is why it is now stating its desire to retain nuclear forces only "at the lowest levels." As proof it cites the U.S. Administration's refusal to modernize the short-distance "Lance" nuclear missiles deployed in Europe. But such assurances do not tally well with the plans to deploy in Europe 450 new, more sophisticated U.S. air-launched missiles with a range of over 400 km. Washington and London would like the FRG above all to agree to deploy these weapons on its territory. If we are to believe REUTER, Bonn's reply was categorical: "This is not the time to speak of new nuclear missiles which could reach the Soviet Union from German territory."

To all appearances, that is also the opinion of the majority of other West European capitals. Nonetheless the threat is not going away. British public circles are discussing with alarm and resolutely denouncing the conservative government's readiness to accept the new Transatlantic "nuclear gifts." Up to 700 U.S. nuclear weapons are already concentrated on the British Isles. Together with the new air-launched missiles their number would be in excess of 1,100.

Incidentally, differences are also appearing in NATO over another question of some importance. In connection with their declared intention to make amendments to the bloc's military strategy, British representatives are insisting that nuclear arms, and modernized ones at that, be kept on forward positions as before. But everyone knows that "forward positions" mean primarily FRG territory. And therefore Bonn, as the British newspaper the DAILY MAIL reports, has assessed the nuclear plans which are being nurtured on the banks of the Thames as being almost a return to the "cold war."

We must also mention NATO's attitude toward the CSCE process. The Turnberry session's final communique devotes a considerable number of words to it—relating to its consolidation as a mechanism of reforms and stability, as an instrument for safeguarding security and cooperation within the framework of a united Europe. The role of the CSCE process is indeed hard to overestimate. The high assessment given of it in NATO can only be welcomed. At the same time you cannot help being perplexed by the thesis, contained in the selfsame NATO document, to the effect that the CSCE's functions are called on merely to supplement the functions of NATO.

In the present crucial period when the Warsaw Pact is embarking on a revision of its very nature, the question of what NATO's response will be is becoming particularly topical. Can we expect a countermovement from this bloc primarily as regards the search for a mutually acceptable approach toward the problem of Germany's unification, the transition from safeguarding security on a bloc basis to creating a new all-European system of security, and the replacement of the military doctrine elaborated and adopted back in the period of the "cold war" with a new and strictly defensive doctrine?

All this is essential for the peoples of Europe—having put an end forever to reprisals, mutual suspicion, and hostility—to live under conditions of lasting peace, good-neighborliness, and mutually advantageous cooperation.

Recent Developments in East Europe Viewed

PM1206140890 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 22, 29 May-4 Jun 90 pp 13-15

[Article by Karen Brutents, head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee: "The Continent's New Landscape. The Soviet Union and the Changes in the Region"]

[Text] The turbulent changes in Eastern Europe can be regarded as the most important political events not only of the entire postwar European history. These changes have a very special meaning for the Soviet Union, which is a neighbour, often an immediate neighbour, of East European countries. These countries have been allies and close partners of the U.S.S.R. throughout the postwar years. The dramatic shifts there are organically connected with perestroika in the Soviet Union itself. But for perestroika in Moscow, changes in Warsaw, Prague, Sofia, Bucharest, Berlin and Budapest would hardly have been possible.

How does one see the developments in East Europe from Moscow?

The point of departure in assessing East European developments is the understanding that these developments are not a chance coincidence, but a result of deep-going processes. In fact, East European nations rejected the regimes which had distanced themselves from the masses by a wall of political alienation and ideological dogmas, used an economically impotent model of development, displayed rare inertness, rare for our time, and stayed deaf to the popular aspirations and the demands of the time. The authoritarian bureaucratic power is being replaced by structures which intend to derive strength from the free expression of popular will, historical and national traditions.

That is why the Soviet Union, despite all the complexity of the developments in the region, did not hesitate to assume a constructive stand in relation to changes in Eastern Europe. The U.S.S.R. did not either abandon its allies in trouble or stay indifferent to their woes—the Soviet public still can feel an emotional aftertaste of the collapse of East European regimes. The Soviet stand was not a time-serving move just for the sake of adjusting Soviet policies to new realities. And by no means it was a manifestation of irritation with the reckless behaviour of some friendly regimes, who kept stubbornly ignoring realities and asserting that all social problems had been solved in their countries.

On the contrary, such Soviet stand logically followed from the political choice made in 1985 and the new political strategy. One of the fundamental principles of new thinking, as it was declared at the beginning of perestroika, is the respect of the freedom of choice of peoples. Five years later, the Soviet Union demonstrated loyalty to this principle and preparedness to adhere to it, even in the sphere of vital Soviet interests.

The Soviet Union assumed this stance despite the fact that some Western capitals urged it to react differently, in particular, when the dramatic events in Romania were at their height. On the other hand, some forces inside the country appealing to tragic episodes of our history—Eastern Europe is the region which has traditionally been a source of danger to security and the very existence of the U.S.S.R.—continue to accuse the Soviet leadership of having "indifferently watched" the demise of East European regimes. These are voices from the past, however. They are not consonant with the new vision of the world, the new criteria in assessing the international situation generated in a radical reevaluation of both the experience of the past and the current needs and realities. Two aspects can be pointed out in this connection.

First. The changing situation allows the Soviet Union to strengthen its security on a new, more steady and more reliable basis. At present, the natural focus of political attention are such factors of the transition period like weakening of the Warsaw Treaty, transformation of military and military-political relations between the Soviet Union and other WTO [Warsaw Treaty Organization] members, the German unification. All these factors may complicate our position in the traditionally confrontation setup of the security relations.

The Soviet Union, however, just like our European partners, will only benefit from the emergence of an area of democracies on our Western borders. The situation when the Soviet Union is surrounded by sovereign countries which shape their future independently and do not regard their Eastern neighbour as the force which restricts their sovereign rights, meets the state interests of the Soviet Union, provided, of course, these interests are interpreted correctly. The climate of trust and really stable interstate relations can be created not by the ossified and, as it has turned out, fragile ideological bonds, but through equitable and voluntary cooperation guided by inherent interests of each people.

It is becoming obvious today that democracy and security on the continent are closely interconnected. A secure Europe is a democratic Europe. Another important fact is that the drive for democracy in the east of Europe is drawing closer the two parts of the continent. This, we believe, makes it easier to work out a concerted policy of all European states.

Second. Just like perestroika in the Soviet Union, changes in Eastern Europe help close the postwar chapter of European history and heal all the scars left by the war and "cold" confrontation. A hitherto inconceivable opportunity is emerging to overcome the split of Europe and the military confrontation, to create an all-European zone of mutual trust, cooperation and collective, not bloc, security, to implement the idea of a pan-European home from the Atlantic to the Urals. It is only natural that the Soviet Union and East European countries, while preserving their traditional cooperation, are becoming increasingly open to political and economic links with the West. Reforms in Eastern Europe may help open up a new page in the history of East-West relations.

The Soviet Union, of course, cannot stay indifferent to what has happened to the Communist parties and all left-wing socialism-oriented forces of the region. It would be hypocritical to insist on the opposite. The lessons of these parties' and forces' failures and collapses require a serious in-depth analysis. These lessons are useful for the U.S.S.R., too, because they are part of our common history. It is important to stress, though, that we do not regard these events as the ultimate collapse of the socialist idea, but as the collapse of the ideological and political phenomenon created in accordance with Stalinist tenets and "administrative socialism."

Besides, it would be wrong to succumb to the general agitation and to start blackening everything in Eastern Europe's life of the postwar decades. Characteristically, despite all Stalinist distortions, the working people in East European countries have developed a reliable system of social security which they cherish, as is demonstrated by East Germany. This example serves to confirm the vitality of the socialist idea. Let us not forget that the West German working people won a great share of their gains thanks to the fact that the ruling quarters in West Germany had to reckon with the existence of the G.D.R.

The rejection of Stalinism could not but shift the needle of the East European political barometer noticeably to the right. But at the time of upheavals, the pendulum of public sentiment and red-hot emotions always sways too far. Later, the faculty of more mature reflection, historical memory, more natural vision and a sense of proportion will return, and the pendulum will start swaying normally.

The recent events give a new dimension to the Soviet Union's relations with its neighbours in the West. It must be stressed that reforms of these relations are facilitated by the Soviet Union being the first to start moving from the old model of cooperation with East European countries and other allies.

It is obvious, however, that these relations are now entering a qualitatively new stage, become clearer, healthier and more reliable. There is every prerequisite for this.

The uniformity of thinking used to be the cornerstone of our bonds. Elements of political chaperoning on the part of the U.S.S.R., which were quite expensive for us, by the way, also played a serious role. In the sphere of trade alone we used to lose, as experts believe, billions of rubles annually.

Ideology-free relations, in their turn, will be based on real long-term national interests which will draw closer and intertwine innermost natural factors—historical, geographical, economic and cultural ones, and the efforts for more security. In our view, the new model of cooperation will be based on independence, non-interference in the internal affairs, equal dialogue, mutual respect and trust, mutual benefit and genuine partnership.

One would hardly object to the idea that the linkage between changes in Eastern Europe and perestroika in the Soviet Union, a new image of the U.S.S.R. will be a very dynamic and promising factor of stronger cooperation.

It must be also noted that the past of our relations, which we are now scathingly criticizing, contains a lot of positive experience well remembered by the peoples. We cooperated fruitfully in many spheres, exchanging the results of labour of our peoples. Mutually beneficial contacts of scientists, cultural figures, other experts and common citizens added human warmth to our relations. Besides, the East European countries had been liberated from fascism by Soviet soldiers, hundreds of thousands of whom lost their lives and lie buried there.

It deserves a special mention that the Soviet Union has never had any prejudice against the new East European leaders. On the contrary, respecting the popular choice, we have been open and benevolent from the very start.

I believe that the recent successful visits to Moscow by Presidents Havel of Czechoslovakia and Jaruzelski of Poland, the visits by the Polish Premier, Mazowiecki, and other East European statesmen bear this out convincingly.

It seems appropriate to stress that the Soviet Union stays loyal to its allied commitments regarding the security of East European countries. The Soviet stand (shared by East European governments) is that we remain allies.

Naturally, the Warsaw Treaty cannot survive in its old form. Not only because of the changes in East Europe. A Warsaw Treaty transformation is required by realities of pan-European development and the interests of the establishment in Europe of a system of collective security.

There is no denying, of course, that the Warsaw Treaty is going through a difficult period. But this organization, provided the role of its military component is reduced, seems to have vital roots and prospects as a political and coordinating structure. The future of the Warsaw Treaty is in its evolution to an instrument of political consultation, promoting political and military detente, disarmament and arms control. At the same time, it will remain the guarantor of security and inviolability of the borders of its member states until all-European security structures are created. It appears that eventually, the future of the Warsaw Treaty and NATO will depend on their ability to adapt to the changing situation, to act as stabilizers of interstate relations and a force which creates the conditions for its own disintegration.

Of course, it would be naive to maintain that smooth and stable relations between the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe are already guaranteed. These relations will be a difficult business with its ups and downs, deviations and painful manifestations of the shadowy aspects of the past. It is also obvious that the desired state of relations can be only achieved by good will, common sense and purposeful efforts of all the sides involved.

So far we have been speaking on the positive aspect of the changes. There are factors, however, which cannot but create a certain amount of justified concern. One canot ignore the fact that reforms in Eastern Europe pose some difficut questions to Europeans and the world public at large.

Against the background of the unclear situation and elements of destabilization, which are quite natural during any transition period, we are now observing an upsurge of nationalist aspirations. Once supressed by Stalinism and disguised by lip-service to internationalism, nationalism has sort of broken free at last. It is often militant, anti-Soviet and directed against neighbouring countries and ethnic minorities. This nationalism can reanimate old conflicts and differences, which in the postwar years made Eastern Europe the continent's least stable region.

If the events there develop in this course, this will mean rocking the boat. It would be even more dangerous if, in defiance of the lessons of history, European and other countries were to resume the policy of dividing spheres of interests and knocking up miniblocs, to return to the attempts to set Eastern European countries against each other.

The Soviet people are naturally very much alarmed by the emergence in a number of countries of ultra-right, even neo-fascist forces, the strive of some quarters there to political revenge, to settle the old political scores, etc.

The gravest danger, however, is that certain very influencial political circles in Europe and elsewhere are tempted to make use of the current changes in the east of Europe to upset the balance of forces on the continent. These forces plan to woo our allies to their blocs, confining the security zone of the U.S.S.R. to the Soviet territory and advancing the forward edge of NATO up to the Soviet borders.

Strictly speaking, the emergence of this tendency can be viewed as natural for those who continue to watch new, unprecedented developments in the international arena through the old lens of confrontation, those who are trumpeting NATO's "victory" in the cold war. Moreover, an absence of such designs and schemes would have seemed strange, because the dramatic experience of the past decades generated a corresponding mentality and secured stable positions for the forces which advocate this mentality.

If this tendency prevails, it would be a tragedy for Europe and the world at large. Such logics can only lead international relations into another impasse and provoke new confrontations. The Soviet Union would be tempted to return to its traditional response. This variant of the future seems too gloomy even to consider.

It would be historical blindness to seek short-term unilateral advantages to the detriment of common long-term interests (the Soviet Union with its tremendous potential will always be there any way).

In this connection, one must stress that for the Soviet Union, the developments in Eastern Europe have a domestic dimension, too. Our society is not immune to their impact. The West will have to reckon with profound feelings of the Soviet people connected with the bitter memory of aggressions, including Hitler's aggression, which descended onto the U.S.S.R. via East European expanses, inflicting devastating losses. Considering a possible reaction of the Soviet public, one should not ignore the fact that the inertia of adminstrative approach to all problems, including foreign political ones, is still strong and that many people continue to regard force as the only way to guarantee security.

Undoubtedly, the significance of the political tribulations in the East European countries spreads far beyond the geographical confines of the region. They are a powerful impetus for the breakthrough into the continent's peaceful and non-confrontational tomorrow, as well as an impetus for other regions of the world.

The human community has entered the stage of profound transformations, and democratization of the entire world order becomes a powerful reforming force.

Countries and peoples have entered a period of hopes and apprehensions. The task now is to live up to the newly opened opportunities.

Results of Summit's Outcome Considered

PM1606211390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Article by observer Aleksandr Golts under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "But Will We Have Enough Missiles?"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, which on the whole assessed positively the results of the visit to Washington by President M.S. Gorbachev of the USSR, set the tone for these days of June which are full of drama and hopes. Today it is clear to everyone that the talks, which were meant to demonstrate the foreign policy priorities of the USSR and the United States in conditions of an international atmosphere which changes day by day, convincingly showed that both Moscow and Washington, acting from the sense of high responsibility that two great powers bear, intend to continue moving from rivalry toward cooperation and partnership.

However, it seems to me that the manner whereby it was possible to achieve a high degree of mutual understanding in such complex conditions is also of no small importance. After all, our president was not sinning against the truth when he stated that his position in the United States was not that of a weak supplicant. Thanks to television, we could see how he diplomatically—if at times quite firmly—put some of his interlocutors in their place when they tried to dictate to the Soviet Union how to conduct this matter or that.

Meanwhile, both on the eve of and during the visit, the U.S. mass media were virtually unanimous in the view that no single leader has come to the United States bearing such a burden of domestic problems. It must even be admitted that it sometimes seemed to those of us watching the visit from Moscow that the situation within the country makes the USSR president's position vulnerable, to put it mildly. The problems of the Baltic, the confrontation in the Transcaucasian republics, the very deep socioeconomic disorders—and, in addition to all that, at the very last moment there was the intercontinental polemic between the president of the USSR and the newly elected chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet who, at his first press conference, hinted quite plainly that the "center" might find that it soon had nothing to lead. You will agree that such a situation can hardly be called a foreign policy trump card.

In that situation, the U.S. administration did not stoop to a tough approach. Furthermore, it seems, President Bush immediately rejected the tempting opportunity to take maximum advantage of the difficulties which the other side was facing. No wonder that the results of the meeting were a considerable irritation to confrontation-minded circles in the United States. I shall cite Richard Perle, whom readers know well, who asks not without some dismay: How can it be that the Soviet president was able to turn such weak positions into strong ones?

Indeed, how was that possible? Here, like Pushkin, we could ask: "Who helped us?—Was it the frenzy of the people? Barclay, the winter, or the Russian God?" Of those options, the frenzy of the people, although it does exist, can hardly help in foreign policy. Any more than the weather which, in the missile and computer age, can influence only the country's agriculture. I do not want in any way to undermine the contribution to the success of the talks made by our foreign policy strategists, first and foremost M.S. Gorbachev himself. I am sure that they needed considerable composure and diplomatic tact. But you will agree that it takes two to tango, and if Washington hadn't shown a readiness to agree little would have come of it. What about the Russian God? He too, in theory, should not have too great an influence on the Americans. For example, what divine grace descended on George Bush who, as we know, can be tough even with his closest allies like Japan when discussing what he considers U.S. interests?

Seriously though, the Washington meeting, which took place at a very complex time for our country, makes you think about the Soviet Union's present position in the world arena. What are the factors which make us a world power which plays such a decisive role in the life of the entire planet and which the United States cannot ignore? Is it economic influence? The USSR has vast natural resources, skilled workers, and generally a considerable economic potential. But, sadly, only a potential. Everyone knows that our involvement in world economic processes is minimal. Is it the stability of a huge country which occupies one-sixth of the globe? Sadly not that either. The main thing which makes us a world power today, apparently—regrettable though it may be—is our military potential. And the sincere readiness to reduce it is the very trump card which makes it possible to safely negotiate all the trials and tribulations of world interrelations.

The why and how we created this potential are the topic for a separate discussion. The most important positive result of recent years, it seems to me, was the profound realization of the global danger of nuclear confrontation and the need to resolutely reduce the military potential. Our leaders had the boldness to break the vicious circle of nuclear confrontation and to see that parity, achieved at such a high level of armaments, no longer provides security. Furthermore, by our actions in the disarmament sphere—sometimes unilateral ones—by our readiness to find compromises, and by our affirmation in real life of the principles of defense sufficiency we have shown the path away from the nuclear abyss. In the process, we have convinced our Western partners of our sincerity and created a basis for confidence. The second point is that we have demonstrated not by our words but by our deeds that, henceforth, we do not intend trying to impose our way of life on other countries. It was our perestroyka which was the catalyst for democratic changes in the East European countries. Our reaction to the turbulent events there and the USSR's firm resolve to qualitatively transform the Warsaw Pact are convincing evidence of the sincerity of Soviet policy.

Those are the factors which, in fact, also removed any material basis for talking about a "Soviet military threat." Here in my view is the secret of the unusual popularity of the Soviet perestroyka and of our leader. Both President Bush and thousands of Americans greeted Gorbachev as first and foremost a figure whose policy frees them from fear. The fear of war.

In these conditions the U.S. administration did not risk complicating the already very difficult process of elaborating strategic arms agreements by introducing any other factors, even factors of fundamental importance to Washington such as, for example, supporting the separatist demands of Lithuania's leaders. As a result, agreement was reached on the main provisions of the future treaty on strategic offensive arms reduction. The document to that effect signed in Washington still has to be analyzed most seriously by parliamentarians, the military, experts, and journalists, too. Meanwhile it is obvious that this is a really complex balance of compromises and mutual concessions. Compromises have their limit too, of course. That limit is well known—ensuring reliable defense.

There is no doubt that the signing of the treaty on strategic offensive arms does not reduce the Soviet Union's security but strengthens it. Furthermore, the treaty is the first manifestation of that future world in which military means will not be the only or even the main way of safeguarding states' security. This offers not just hope but a challenge too. Some Western figures publicly cracked a very malicious joke that the "USSR is Upper Volta with missiles." Such statements are hardly to be taken seriously. But many a true word is spoken in jest. That is why I have to ask myself: Who will we be when the missiles have been eliminated? Do not misunderstand me. I certainly do not mean to say that I like the situation in which people take account of the Soviet Union primarily because of its military potential. I will go further and say that for any patriot to realize that his country's importance in the world is commensurate with its number of warheads is in principle insulting. But whether we like it or not, that is the objective reality today.

I certainly do not grieve for the warheads and missiles that are being cut. Our country is interested in their elimination just as much as other states. But let us think about the future interdependent world. After all, contradictions between states will exist there too. And it is no coincidence, for example, that the policy of the future united Germany is already causing concern to a number of European countries. There is no doubt that national interests will not be abolished in the future, either. I would ask how we will safeguard those interests? Will we have enough missiles or, to be more accurate, a sufficient period of missile reduction so as to restructure the economy, organize relations between the different republics as well as between the republics and the center, and to create a society which is the most open to the world and to man? After all, all these things now form the new parameters of our security. And, to be frank, all the current problems to do with arms reduction become strategic problems.

But do the formal and informal leaders who are ready to fan—or at least encourage—tension for the sake of personal, group, or national ambitions consider that? Does each of us, racked by daily problems and shortages, consider that the motherland's security today depends on his labor wherever he works? I realize that nowadays such arguments, like calls for good and hard work, are not unduly popular. Therefore, I shall venture to quote a leader well respected in our country—Margaret Thatcher. When considering the current situation in the USSR, she likened it to postwar Britain. "No politician in any country can honestly promise people more than they can produce and achieve by their own efforts. Governments do not create goods and services, the people create them," she wrote in the SUNDAY EXPRESS. And she stressed: "There was no magic solution then. As the greatest British statesman said, there is only blood, toil, tears, and sweat. There is no easy solution now, either. There is only toil, determination, and perseverance."

I can agree with that prescription. Only its implementation will give our country true international prestige. A prestige not based solely on a military strength which, of course, we still need.

Roundtable Discusses Major International Issues

LD1706174190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1130 GMT on 17 June broadcasts the 30-minute "International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by All-Union Radio Commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, with guests Political Observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, political observer for Central Television and All-Union Radio.

Levin begins by singling out the German question as the week's single most important issue. Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze began the past week by meeting Genscher in Brest, where they jointly laid a wreath to the memory of the heroes of the fortress, including Shevardnadze's brother; "one event which, in my view, was insufficiently noticed by our media." He continues by saying that the symbolism of this gesture is comparable to the time in 1970 when Brandt laid a wreath to Polish war victims. He considers the Shevardnadze-Genscher wreath to be very significant with regard to the German question.

Shishlin claims that there is no united Western front against the Soviet Union on this issue. The other countries involved all have their own points of view. Shishlin sets out the Western position: "Of course, it is necessary to take into account the security interests of all European states, and primarily of the Soviet Union and Poland. At the same time, however, they suppose that a united Germany's entry into NATO also will give exactly that guarantee that nothing bad will happen to Germany, and the danger of some new military shocks will not emanate from German territory. Of course this point of view does have its sorts of reasons, and so on." However, Shishlin adheres to the more long-term view, that it is more important to lay the foundations of the pan-European home without blocs.

"In this light, I think that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's recent proposal—which clearly makes it understood that the Soviet Union could accept the entry of a united Germany into NATO given the understanding that at the same time Germany, meaning a united, unified Germany, would to some extent also be associated with the Warsaw Pact and that it would not be this united Germany that would become a bone of contention in the new Europe, but would become a kind of bridge between the present state in Europe and its tomorrow—deserves more attentive interpretation." Shishlin then recalls that the next two-plus-four meeting will be held soon. The multitude of dialogues taking place should lead to a solution.

To emphasize the constructive dialogues taking place, Tsvetov reels off a list of recent Soviet foreign policy successes with a brief description of each: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to the United States, where Shevardnadze spoke to Baker; Gorbachev's visit to Canada; Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze's visit to Copenhagen, where he met Baker and Genscher; and the Soviet-German meeting in Brest. On 18 June Shevardnadze will meet Genscher again, and on 22 June there will be a two-plus-four meeting. This all gives reason for hope of a solution.

Tsvetov repeats that the impression given "even by some Western media sometimes" that the two-plus-four conference is actually 1-minus-5, with the Soviet Union out on its own, is false. "Nothing of the sort!" "A search is going on, and I think that, in the main, there are some kind of fundamental notions that encourage, that give hope that his search will be crowned with success."

Shishlin then sets out short-, medium-, and long-term solutions. The former refer to what to do with a united Germany immediately and balance the present state of affairs in Europe. By medium-term solutions, Shishlin means a European summit in the spirit of Helsinki, and the long-term solution refers to a pan-European home without NATO or the Warsaw Treaty Organization. Further causes for optimism are the U.S. agreement to negotiations on tactical nuclear weapons, the Soviet unilateral reduction in tactical weapons, and Thatcher's promulgated arms cuts. Everyone is waiting for the next NATO session, coming up in July, to see NATO's response to the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee's measures to transform the Warsaw Treaty Organization into a primarily political alliance.

Levin remarks that Shishlin has enumerated many events witnessing positive trends in the European situation and adds the case of the "breakthrough at the Vienna negotiations on conventional weapons": the definition of these weapons and the resolution to allow each side 20,000 tanks and 30,000 armored personnel carriers. "Moreover, the proposals made jointly by France and Poland were at the basis of this decision. Thus they found some kind of compromise. This, of course, is a marvelous example of the fact that issues are being resolved. Then, after all, what is the reduction of conventional weapons? Under present conditions we are pursuing the argument that a united Germany in NATO could present a certain threat to us, but when the erosion of the very foundation of this threat is taking place, when the reduction of weapons and of armed forces is occurring, I think we can feel more confident and calm here, just as the West can feel more confident and calm.

"This same week, a sitting of the defense ministers' committee of the Warsaw Pact member-states took place in Berlin, or rather not in Berlin but near Berlin in Straussberg, where the GDR Ministry for Disarmament and Defense is located. In the main, there too, individual ministers talked of the need to change the character of the Warsaw Treaty Organization. This cannot go unnoticed in the West; this cannot fail to cause a response. You see, it is important to note here that, naturally, the former yes-men were not there. And at the Political Consultative Committee sitting a discussion was held among people who formerly never met at one table.

"Now it is possible to say that the cycle of free elections in the East European countries has been completed. In many states people have come to power who, to put it mildly, are in opposition to the former regime, the former set-up. We are finding a common language with them. So why can we not also find a common language with others? Since I have mentioned this cycle, once more this week the results are being collated of the elections in Czechoslovakia—it is being officially renamed the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic—and of elections in Bulgaria. There the second round has yet to take place, but the Bulgarian elections interest me very much since there the Socialist Party, the Bulgarian Socialist Party, being the successor to the Bulgarian Communist Party, is retaining a dominent position, but I think that the reason for this lies, first and foremost, is the fact that it is a profoundly reformed party."

Shishlin says: "This is correct. I agree with this because the Bulgarian comrades have, in the main, worked on anticipating events. They have anticipated events. They have not only put forward slogans anticipating the evolution of public opinion, but they also have acted in an appropriate manner.

"Although I am in no way inclined to over-simplify the tasks facing Czechoslovak and Bulgarian society, and since we already have started talking about this group of countries, I think that one cannot omit to mention the dramatic events in Romania, and the high price of the creation of democracy, and what cataclysms are accompanying this because what has been occurring in Bucharest in no way fits into the framework of the democratic process. I think our Romanian neighbors will analyze and study these events, the nature of these events.

"In any case, we must say that democracy per se is not a medicine. It is, indeed, a means of resolving major political and other tasks in the development of society, but society also must adapt itself to the use of democracy and learn how to use democracy, learn how to work under conditions of democracy. This is not an easy discipline and it is not given to everyone."

Levin sums up the discussion on this question: "I think that here, of course, all of us need to continue studies. Experience is an asset that can be shared. This restructuring of sociopolitical life, this restructuring of economic life in our East European neighbors, as we now call them, is very interesting for us and not just because we still have very close relations with these countries, relations that will continue in the future because there are geographical, historical, and all manner of reasons for this. This experience is also interesting for us because sometimes they have played a pioneering role, doing things which we are only edging toward. Here it is also very important to make sure that we do not create additional complications, this time for ourselves, although no society ever has developed without mistakes. Let us hope that these mistakes will be as few as possible."

Introducing the next topic, Levin turns to Tsvetov: "Vladimir Yakovlevich, while we have been talking about Europe you have been modestly keeping quiet, but now you are holding the cards. After all, this week it was announced that Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze is to visit Japan. According to the announcement, the visit is to take place in the first half of September, and as I have been reading in the Japanese press the very announcement of the forthcoming visit is being regarded as evidence that Soviet-Japanese relations have made very substantial progress as it is now customary to say."

Tsvetov replies: "The Soviet and Japanese foreign ministers make visits to each other's countries every year. This time, Shevardnadze's visit will be a special one because the main item on the agenda will be discussion of the future or forthcoming visit Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev plans to make to Japan."

Levin interjects: "Well, this visit already is being spoken of with some certainty. The stage of practical preparations is already starting."

"Yes," Tsvetov rejoins, "because Mikhail Sergeyevich himself said when he was in the United States that he definitely would visit Japan next year. There are grounds for saying—at all events, I very much hope this is the case—that this visit of Gorbachev's to Japan will mark a substantial breakthrough in Soviet-Japanese relations."

Levin: "What is it about this relationship that particularly interests us at the moment? What are we worried about? What complicates these relations?"

Tsvetov says: "We and Japan are interested in quite different things. We are interested in the strengthening of political contacts. We are interested in the strengthening of economic ties, but the Japanese are interested in only one thing: the territorial question. Furthermore, Japan is making the further development of all other aspects of Soviet-Japanese relations dependent on the solution of this question; in fact, its solution in precisely the way the Japanese side want it solved.

"Well, I will not say that the Soviet side welcomes this approach, but since this is the way the Japanese side looks at things, since our partner is insisting on a discussion of this problem, of precisely this problem, the Soviet side is not rejecting such a discussion."

Levin: "Well, I think that this is already progress, to a certain extent, progress—again I use this word—because at one time we categorically refused even to mention this subject."

Tsvetov: "Yes, not only did we refuse to mention it at an inter- governmental level, we journalists were categorically forbidden even to touch on this subject."

Levin: "Now that we have been given our freedom, we definitely will discuss it."

Tsvetov: "Yes, and we are right to do so for the following reason: while we kept quiet about this problem, the Japanese side went on about it all the time. As a result, at every meeting—whether it is a governmental, official, or public meeting—the Japanese are far better prepared to discuss this problem than we are. The broad masses of the Soviet population are not prepared for an equal discussion of this question with the Japanese. Well, the government's position is as follows: borders will not be altered."

Levin: "You mean our borders."

Tsvetov: "Yes, our borders, first and foremost. The borders will not be altered. The islands are Soviet, therefore while this problem can be discussed, of course, the Soviet Union will not agree to the Japanese demands because, as was stated at official level on one occasion, the Soviet Union does not have surplus land. This is the government's position. I do not think that you and I will discuss it since we are state radio employees."

Levin: "We will merely acknowledge it as a fact."

Tsvetov: "Yes, we will do no more than acknowledge it as a fact. Instead, we will discuss the position of public opinion. Here the range is very great, from the purely humorous position of Garri Kasparov to the fairly serious—I would even say, the very serious position—taken by Yeltsin. Garri Kasparov suggests a simple solution: let us sell the islands. We need hard currency. We sold Alaska so let us sell these four islands, too. Well, we can smile at this proposal and forgive this extravagant idea since it comes from someone we know quite well and respect.

"The second position is that of Yuriy Afanasyev. I have in mind the rector of the Moscow Historical Archives Institute. He says we should hand the islands over unconditionally. I think this position is wrong. To hand them over means revising the results of World War II. This means that the principle of inviolability of borders is being broken. Right now we will not discuss the question of whether these borders were drawn up well or badly, correctly or incorrectly. We will not go into the history of the question because it is now very difficult to work out who was the first to reap hay on these islands: we or the Japanese."

Tsvetov continues: "However, the fact that the economic activity of the Russians was broader and deeper there than that of the Japanese is a different question. Another reason why we will not go into the history of the question is because this would be a rather unproductive activity at the present time. To hand over the islands—in other words, to agree completely with the Japanese demand—is impossible in my view. Why? Because this precedent would set off a chain reaction along the entire length of the Soviet border. There are no two countries in the world which do not have territorial claims against each other. This is because of the many zig-zags, so to speak, in the history of mankind. For this same reason we could, if we wanted to, also make territorial claims against any of our neighboring states. Furthermore, the question of borders has become a very serious, complex, and I would even say bloody question in interethnic relations within our country. Therefore, to set a precendent over external borders would mean creating additional difficulties within the Soviet Union itself.

"Therefore, I personally prefer Yeltsin's position. He has proposed five stages for the solution of the territorial problem. The first stage is a recognition that a problem exists. In the second stage, the islands would be proclaimed a zone of joint or free enterprise for all countries, not necessarily for Japan and the Soviet Union alone but also for the United States, Taiwan, South Korea, and anyone else you care to mention. Third comes the demilitarization of the islands. Fourth would be the conclusion of a peace treaty. Yeltsin believes that 15-20 years should be allowed for these four stages. After this period has expired, when the world has changed to a significant extent and the attitudes of the people who will be living in this world also have changed considerably, it will be possible to embark on the fifth stage.

"The fifth stage could be realised in three different ways: first, the islands could be turned into a joint protectorate of the Soviet Union and Japan. Second, these islands could quite simply be made independent, given independent status perhaps under UN auspices. Third and finally, the islands indeed could be handed over to Japan, but that is 20 years away so to speak. This is a long way off, so to speak. We will not try to guess how people will decide this question then.

"Although I agree with Yeltsin's position, I still would change his stages in places. His third stage is the demilitarization of the islands. I think this is where we have to start. Our first step has to be the demilitarization of the four southern islands of the Kuriles chain which in fact are the reason for all the fuss. Only then do we go on to admit that the problem exists, proclaim the islands to be a free enterprise zone, and so on. This is because the demilitarization of the islands will make the biggest impression on Japanese public opinion.

"Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev does not address the question of the Northern Territories all that often, but when he does, he takes quite a hard line. Now why is this? There are two reasons for this: first, and most important, Soviet public opinion is not prepared to accept even a discussion of this problem. You know, the imperial tranditions are embedded so deeply in our consciousness that when I say, not that I would hand the islands over, but that I would merely consider ways of resolving the territorial problem, I get letters asking me whether my salary is paid in yen. Therefore..."

Levin interrupts: "We can take advantage of the opportunity to explain, straightaway, that we are paid not in yen but in Soviet Rubles."

"In Soviet Rubles," Shishlin echoes.

Tsvetov: "Soviet public opinion is not prepared for this. Therefore, a very great deal of work needs to be done if we are to enter into negotiations. The Japanese have started this work, it must be said.

"Second, it seems that another reason for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's hard line on this question—and I stress that this is merely my personal opinion—is that he has not yet gotten round to a careful study of this problem. However, now that a visit to Japan is on the agenda, I think he will take a personal interest in this question himself. And from our quite recent experience, our previous experience of his contacts with the leaders of capitalist countries, you and I know that when he decides to study and resolve any problem, the boldest political solutions may ensue."

Levin: "You have in mind, for example, the recent meeting in San Francisco between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President No Tae-u of South Korea?"

Tsvetov: "Precisely, precisely."

Levin: "News of this meeting has been welcomed throughout the world. Incidentally, I had a very intriguing conversation recently with a member of the Chinese Embassy staff. I asked him: what is the Chinese view of this? I got the impression that they were envious."

Tsvetov: "That is quite right, quite right. Nevertheless, the main evaluator of Soviet foreign policy, in particular the activities of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev on the international arena, is not a foreign diplomat or the foreign press but our Soviet people. Views on this among the people differ very widely. Therefore, we will not try to predict what Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev will undertake in relations to Japan, what proposals or ready-made decisions he will take there. The one thing of which I am absolutely certain is that his approach will be bold and unorthodox."

Levin: "That is typical of our entire foreign policy at the present time. The results we are seeing, above all the significant increase in the level of our country's security, indicate that such actions are producing the desired effect.

"And here we conclude our program, Esteemed Comrades. You have been listening to 'International Observers at the Roundtable.' Taking part were Political Observers Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin and Vladimir Yakovlevich Tsvetov, and All-Union Radio Commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin. All the best."

Contradictory Reports View PRC-SRV Talks

OW1706002290 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] According to a statement by Chinese Assistant Foreign Minister Xu Dunxin, differences still exist between China and Vietnam on their attitudes concerning resolution of the Cambodian issue. The statement was made by the Chinese representative at the airport in Bangkok upon his arrival from Vietnam. He held a series of informal meetings and talks with the Vietnamese Foreign Ministry in Vietnam. According to him, the main contradictions between China and Vietnam lie in differences in their attitudes toward the issues of establishment of an interim administration and control of the Armed Forces after a cease-fire takes effect in Cambodia. Xu Dunxin, the first Chinese representative of such a high level to visit Vietnam in 11 years, announced that Vietnam and China do not have plans for holding talks in the future.

[Moscow International Service in Mandarin at 1400 GMT on 16 Jun carries a similar item which reports the following: "He [Xu Dunxin] said both Vietnam and China have plans for holding further talks."]

UNIDO Benefits Viewed By Delegation Chief

LD1506122390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 0830 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newcast]

[Text] The sixth session of the UN Council for Industrial Development, UNIDO, has ended its work in Vienna.

[Correspondent V. Mikheyev] Ambassador Timerbayev, the head of the Soviet delegation at the session, speaks: [Timerbayev] The UNIDO session, which has just ended, is an important stage in giving an impetus to the development of industry in various countries. And of course, first and foremost, Soviet viewers are interested in what benefits this organization can bring to the Soviet Union. It will bring immense benefits, especially in the conditions of the economic reform which have recently been declared. Incidentally, UNIDO recently set up a center in Moscow for industrial development which invites Soviet enterprises, cooperatives, and Soviet institutions to work together directly with this organization. I can even give you the name of this center: it is 198-98-03; 198-99-03. Comrades, get in touch, and this organization can help you.

The organization put forward two more programs at its session. These are a program of conversion, in other words a transfer of production from military to civilian usage, and a program for the creation of ecologically pure production facilities. This is very important, and it will place this organization on a par with those tasks facing mankind in the 1990s. [video shows shot of the session and Timerbayev being interviewed]

United States & Canada

Military Spokesman on U.S. Nuclear Tests

LD1506144590 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—"The underground nuclear blast at the U.S. test site in Nevada on June 13 proves that the United States is continuing its work aimed at further improvement of its nuclear potential," Soviet Defence Ministry Main Department deputy head Lieutenant-General Sergey Zelentsov told TASS.

He recalled that France and China also continue nuclear testing, while the Soviet Union consistently pursues its policy aimed at a complete ending of nuclear weapons tests and makes substantial moves to nuclear disarmament.

Tests have not been conducted in the Soviet Union since November 1989. Such actions by the Soviet Union are regarded in the world as an attempt to prompt the United States to support Soviet peace initiatives, which could lead to a comprehensive and complete nuclear test ban and, finally, to the full elimination of weapons of mass destruction, Zelentsov said.

At the same time, underground nuclear tests continue at the Nevada test site. It seems that the United States is interested in the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament, rather than a full nuclear test ban, he said.

Approaches to the discussion and solution of such an important problem as a complete nuclear test ban should be based on the principle of a reasonable defence sufficiency for the Soviet Union and the United States. In the current situation, the Soviet Union is forced to continue tests, the general said.

U.S. Foreign Military Presence Questioned

LD1706100390 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 16 Jun 90

["Moscow Viewpoint" program presented by Valentin Zorin]

[Text] Some time ago the former assistant secretary of state and ambassador to Moscow Arthur Hartman took part in a panel discussion program that I hosted on national television; he is a well-known man in this country. During that discussion Mr. Hartman insisted that while the republic and East European nations wholeheartedly support the withdrawal of Soviet troops, no demands have been made in West Europe for the withdrawal of U.S. troops. My understanding of the situation in West Europe suggests that it is different from Mr. Hartman's description of it. The U.S. military bases in Greece and Spain, for instance, are a serious problem for the governments of the two countries because, for one, the public in these countries are critical of the U.S. military presence. The U.S. military presence in other countries is also causing a great deal of public concern. In South Korea, for instance, the public very often protests against the presence of U.S. troops and demand their withdrawal.

Washington's assurances that the U.S. base in Guantanamo in Cuba is there because of an appropriate agreement signed a long time ago are not accepted by the Cubans. By the same token, Americans themselves did not accept as lawful the acts of the British king after their revolution. It is only natural, therefore, that the Cubans do not consider the agremeent signed by the regime swept away by their revolution lawful.

The issue of foreign military presence is becoming an increasingly pressing one. In most countries, U.S. military bases appeared back in the 1950's at the height of the cold war. They were, speaking figuratively, the first acts of that war. The aircraft stationed at these bases were targeted at Soviet territory. Since then the situation has changed dramatically, but the network of U.S. military bases around the Soviet Union is still there, and the U.S. taxpayers pay billions of dollars for it. Clearly that is a case of an anachronism in U.S. foreign policy. It would therefore seem logical to ask why, in the present fast changing international circumstances, the United States continues to keep its military bases overseas?

Our satisfaction with the results of the Soviet-American summit is quite justified, but still we all must realize that we have not covered the entire road before us. It is more likely that we are at the very beginning of that road. The issue of Soviet and American military presence in other countries should be one of the focal points of further dialogue.

Economic Conversion Discussed With U.S.

LD1406090690 Moscow TASS in English 0556 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Special to TASS by Genine Babakian]

[Text] New York, June 14, 1990—Four high-level Soviet officials joined American business leaders in Denver, Colorado, this week to discuss economic conversion to a peacetime economy, an issue that is gaining momentum in the post-cold war era.

One hundred and fifty American business, government and academic leaders participated in the "Roundtable on Economic Conversion," organized by Colorado University's Institute for International Business. The two-day conference, that ended Tuesday, explored opportunities for reduced military spending made possible by improved U.S.-Soviet relations, and the effect such reductions could have on both U.S. and Soviet economies.

Among the participants were several CEO's of the defense industry—including Norman Augustine of Martin Marietta and Don Fuqua of Aerospace Industries—whose participation reflects the growing concern among major defense contractors as they face drastic militry cuts in the 1990s.

"It was extremely successful and the Soviet delegation particularly made it a great success," former Senator Gary Hart, told TASS. Hart was responsible for initiating contact with the Soviets, which was headed by Vladimir Koblov, first deputy chairman of the State Committee on Planning. "Their contribution really made the conference worthwhile in the sense of educating us as to the problems the Soviet Union faces. I think those of us in the U.S. can learn from the steps being taken by the Soviet Union." Hart was referring to a comprehensive plan towards economic conversion presented by the Soviet team which, in addition to retraining, concentrates on improved public sector goods, medical and educational services, and agricultural technology.

Participants also discussed U.S.-Soviet trade and opportunities to assist the Soviets in their transition from a planned to a market economy.

Included on the American team were such prominent figures as Kenneth Adelman, former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Bev Dolan, CEO of Textron, James Gailbraith of the University of Texas at Austin, and Victor Palmieri, former U.S. ambassador-at-large. On the Soviet team were Valentin Smyslov, first deputy chairman of the State Committee on Planning, Vsevolod Avdouyevskiy, chairman of the Soviet National Commission for Conversion Assistance, and Vitaliy Shabanov, deputy defense minister.

'Top Priority' Program Discusses Summit

LD1006050590 Moscow in English to North America 2200 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Hello and welcome to the "Top Priority" show. I am Nulam Urazbayev, hosting this program today and our guests in the studio are Viktor Kremenyuk, who is deputy director of the Institute of U.S. and Canada Studies in Moscow and Jonathan Saunders of CBS news, a Moscow-based correspondent. Welcome, we'll focus our discussion today on the results of the summit, which took place a week ago in Washington between President Bush and President Gorbachev.

A few days after the summit the euphoria over it has subsided a little bit and a more sober analysis is going to take place to see what really happened behind all those smiles, handshaking and headlines. [passage omitted] What do you think was important about this summit?

[Saunders] Well I think there are four important features to this summit. The first is that the meeting of the two leaders got momentum going again in arms control. I don't think in and of itself the agreements they reached on the START Treaty are that significant because they have been blown out of proportion. It is not a 50-percent reduction. New weapons are still being built and the savings to both sides is not that significant in dollar or hard ruble terms but it did get that process going again after it had been stalled and that, I think, is quite significant. Second of all, the surprise announcement of a trade agreement I think is important. Third, a side issue but an important one, the growing rapprochement between the Soviet Union and South Korea with South Korea not only being seen as a trade partner, South Korea being seen as another element in a new East Asia policy, and South Korea being seen as perhaps a model for kinds of Soviet economic development are important. Finally, the fourth factor and I think perhaps the one that may be remembered for a while, is the contrast in background against which this summit was played, that is tremendous euphoria for Gorbachev in the United States, discontent in some ways in the Soviet Union; people trying to address the question of higher prices. And the dichotomy between the incredibly successful Soviet foreign policy and the problems that the new Soviet leadership is having in implementing the same kind of structural changes in the economy and domestic politics at home—something that's a lot more intractable but something that may turn out to be a lot more basic to the success or the failure of the Gorbachev era.

[Urazbayev] Viktor, would you like to comment?

[Kremenyuk] Well, I share completely what was said about this meeting. I could add only maybe a few things: First of all what is really important is that the Soviet-American summits are becoming something of a business as usual thing. [passage omitted] Second, both leaders have gone rather far in drawing the line under the cold war period. I mean their closeness on the issues of arms control, their desire to discuss and to find solutions to the other issues which can be regarded as a legacy of the cold war, and their desire to look forward. Third, they have now I think very, very close and maybe even warm personal rapport, which is also very important for both sides, for both countries, for the world. And I think that in this respect of course it was natural to expect that not all the things would be finally signed, agreed upon and so on. Of course such complicated issue, the issues of I would say a new type, like Germany, like Baltic republics, like the Soviet reform, they were discussed. The views on some issues are quite close, on the others are not that close but nevertheless they are discussed and the both sides want to find some solutions. That's fine, and I think in this regard the results of the summit may be qualified as excellent.

[Urazbayev] Well, talking about ending the cold war, I think the issue of reunification of Germany was one of the center pieces of the discussion between the two presidents and I think we should take into account the fact that the changes in East Europe, which are the background for the reunification of Germany, were triggered by the reforms in the Soviet Union and the paradox is that those changes are welcomed everywhere as a movement towards more democracy, more progress and on the other hand they have created a very precarious situation when the old system of security in Europe, based on the confrontation between the two superpowers, is becoming more and more obsolete and changes in Germany are going so fast, much faster than the process of building a common European home, that there is a danger that the world leaders might not catch up with this process in creating a new system. There is a lot of talk about changing NATO, creating a common European security system. What do you think, are there any signs that this new system could be created in time to match the process in Germany?

Well, I think both sides have been very bad in staying abreast of events. [passage omitted] The issue of German membership in NATO is a very hard one to resolve because nobody knows that NATO means any more, nobody knows what the Warsaw Pact means any more. [passage omitted] I don't know and I think there are two worries there: There's the historic worry over a warlike fourth reich, and that's what we should call what's coming about in Germany. And I'm not sure what is a better guarantee, a Germany that has Western troops in it so that it can be controlled or a Germany that's been neutralized. [passage omitted] But I also don't know how you keep a economically aggressive Germany neutral.

[Kremenyuk] Well, I can only partially agree here you know that both sides don't have a ready made pattern how to deal with the German problem. I think, you know, what adds a new dimension to this thing, that in a way you know the unification of Germany was regarded as a first step towards a unified Europe and in this regard, of course, when the West came with a suggestion that, well a unified Gemany must go to NATO [laughs] it was, it was accepted as something absolutely unbelievable you know. Just unify Germany and then give it to NATO and that would mean you know that again there will be division of Europe, and so... so I think in this respect [word indistinct] of course it went absolutely contrary to Gorbachev's idea of a European common home, a common house in Europe. And that's why I think...(changes thought] besides there is of course a strong emotional element in the Soviet attitude towards Germany. There is a historical experience there you know, the German aggressions against our country and all that of course adds some (?mental) and... the idea of a Germany, unified Germany, strong, powerful, economically [break in reception] then joining NATO, that was spelt out by the Soviets as a serious disturbance of the balance in Europe. Well, I think that, I agree at the same time that apparently no one has any recipe what to do with that. [passage omitted] I simply think, if, to speak seriously, that it will be a very serious and severe test for both sides to find a solution which would be of course acceptable for the Germans, which would be acceptable for everyone, and that would be maybe a real test for the whole process of CSCE in Europe.

[Saunders] Yeah, and everyone will be looking at the process but they'll be looking at it in military terms and in building a common European home the Germans are going to be the ones doing a lot of the rebuilding of the common European home because part of that house is an economic disaster and they want to play a big role in rebuilding it and that more than militarism is where their power is going to come from and nobody is looking at any controls for their economic power.

[Urazbayev] Before there's a lot of talk that the present system of security in Europe will collapse in case there's no way, there's no fleshed out policy towards the reunified Germany. What do you think could be the potential dangers or risks if the world leaders fail to catch up with this process?

[Saunders] Well, I know that the popular thing in Moscow is to have an apocalyptic mood and think that the sky is falling everywhere, I don't quote think that the sky is falling there yet. I think they will back into some kind of agreement or some kind of understanding but not based on preconceived models. [passage omitted]

[Kremenyuk] Well, I should say that I agree to a large extent that of course it is something which would greatly influence the further course of events in Europe. But it's not the mood in Moscow that you mentioned, it's, as you know, we are the same as you are somewhere amidst transitional period, shifting from structures to the other structures, from one perceptions to the other perceptions. And within this, within this transitional period, when we have situation in East Europe which is absolutely different from what it was a year ago, when we have a situation in Germany which is also different from what it was a year ago; you know, so it would be hard to put up all the things together. So, it is of course thinking along the lines of the worst case scenario that dominates inevitably during this transitional period. If, I think, we had all the other European mechanisms like CSCE going ahead, or CSCE and the others going ahead, I think the mood will change and maybe there will be a more conciliatory approach towards what's happening in Germany and what's happening around Germany.

[Urazbayev] I think we'd better talk about the trade agreement, which was one of the most controversial issues at the summit. It was said that tensions were extremely high. Until the last minute it was not known whether it would be signed or not. Finally it got signed. How would you comment on the situation around the trade agreement and around the possibility of granting the Soviet Union a most-favored-nation status?

[Kremenyuk] Well, as far as I understand, this agreement does not foresee the status of most-favored [nation].

[Saunders] Sure.

[Kremenyuk] But this agreement simply gives much more possibilities for the increase in Soviet-American trade and exchanges. Of course, we badly need such an agreement. It's evident. We want it and there, of course, there were doubts whether it would be signed or not due to all the talk about Lithuania, about emigration law and so on. So I think that the decision, mainly of course by the President, by President Bush, the decision to sign an agreement meant, you know, that the general situation at the summit was quite favorable for it and he regarded—he got, maybe, some explanations from Gorbachev, which helped him to take that decision. Now about the relation of this treaty to the other issues. I think that the fact, by the way, that the Soviet Supreme Soviet, that the Supreme Soviet decided to...

[Saunders, interrupting] Postpone.

[Kremenyuk] Discuss, to postpone the discussion of this law till September, of course gives some breathing space for both sides since each side has to consult the domestic, the different domestic forces, the different domestic groups. Both sides have to regard maybe more soberly what they can do realistically along the lines of this agreement and besides maybe that will give a possibility also to Gorbachev to do something with Lithuania. It's high time, of course, to put an end to that situation. The situation is abnormal. I think that now we have more or less, a situation more or less suitable for the beginning of negotiations and I think that all that can, of course, provide the possibility that the agreement would be ratified.

[Saunders] Well, I agree, I mean, it seems to me that the announcement of the trade agreement being signed was a surprise. I think the President of the United States did the right thing, it surprised me that he did the right thing. If one believes THE WASHINGTON POST, it's because Gorbachev convinced him of the need for the trade agreement. Now, take the case if it had not been signed. What would that say to the world in the context of what's going on in American foreign policy in other directions? They had renewed most-favored-nation trading status with China a year after the Chinese massacred at least a thousand people on Tienanmen Square in front of worldwide television. So an endorsement of a Stalinist, repressive policy on one hand and a non-endorsement of reform on another, what does that say about the priorities of the American Government? Secondly, Soviet Jewish emigration, which was the key issue, is up significantly and just as the Americans have to come through with what they promised the Soviets have to come through with what they promised, to pass the emigration bill. And I agree, putting off what is with one or two exceptions (?Burlatskiy wrote of), a pretty good deal; putting it off until September gives both sides breathing room and anytime Gorbachev wants he can have that bill called up and passed very quickly.

[Urazbayev] I think, to wind up, we have all agreed that although there were no major sensational breakthroughs at this summit, the mere fact that you mentioned that the summits themselves have become regular and the mere fact that the two leaders are going to meet at least twice before the end of this year to follow up on this summit is significant and is a major breakthrough in itself. I thank you for the participation. That's it for the Top Priority show for today. I am Nulam Urazbayev hosting this program and our guests in the studio were Jonathan Saunders of CBS news and Viktor Kremenyuk of the Institution of U.S. and Canada Studies. Thank you. Until next week, goodbye.

China

Rogachev Comments on Bilateral Ties With PRC

OW1806025790 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1200 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Soviet Vice Foreign Minister Rogachev, in a one-to-one dialogue with Moscow Radio's Beijing reporter (Harboyan), talked about details of the development of bilateral relations between the USSR and the PRC. The high-ranking Soviet foreign diplomat believes that, following the visit of PRC State Council Premier Li Peng to the USSR, bilateral relations have developed rapidly. Tens and hundreds of delegations have visited the PRC and the USSR, or have reciprocated visits.

Rogachev particularly pointed out that relations with China have independent value in the priorities of Soviet foreign policy. He said the the Soviet Union has the concensus of all people in this respect. Rogachev said he is convinced that by developing cooperation with China, increasing the trust between the two countries' communist parties and between the people of the two nations will help to facilitate the smooth progress of reforms in the USSR.

PRC Scientific, Technological Cooperation Viewed

OW1506031190 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0200 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Text] In his interview with this station's commentator (Charikov), Academician Laverov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Minister Presidium and chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology, talked about all aspects of scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the PRC. Here is the first part of the interview:

[First announcer]: (Charikov) asked: Comrade Laverov, in your opinion, what is the main direction of scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the PRC?

[Laverov is briefly heard, speaking in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation by second announcer] Academician Laverov answered: What I would like to point out first is the contacts in the field of nuclear energy. Currently, our country is very careful about nuclear energy. Under such circumstances, it is very important to cooperate with others to develop a suitable nuclear power station system. It is necessary to create a beneficial environment in which to develop science and technology. In the field of nuclear power, we must join hands with scholars in China, as well as those in third countries, such the U.S. and Japan, where this issue is also very urgent. It should be pointed out that experts in China are also actively engaged in the study of enhancing the safety of nuclear energy.

The academician added: The second important aspect of the scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the PRC is the research of outer space. As we all know, the USSR and the PRC have signed an agreement to develop outer space research. The purpose of this undertaking is to study natural resources and ecological problems and create a technological system which can be applied in the space in the future. The first batch of Chinese science delegations have visited our space science organizations and raised some interesting ideas on how to develop the research in this field. What I would like to point out here is that Chinese experts are not just users of scientific information and data obtained by the USSR. We work together. Our cooperation is a joint endeavor, based on equal principles by both countries, rather than by individual experts. This, I believe, is very important.

One of the important aspects of Sino-Soviet cooperation is the study of earthquake prediction. Our scholars have greatly improved the quality and reliability of earthquake prediction. Both scientific academies of the USSR and the PRC have engaged in the study of this field. They also cooperated with other countries. As a matter of fact, our country has already developed an international earthquake prediction system. We have established close contacts with earthquake prediction centers in the U.S.

[First announcer] Academician Laverov concluded his remarks by saying: [Laverov is briefly heard speaking in Russian, fading into Mandarin translation by second announcer] We have made a decision with the PRC to launch a large-scale scientific and technological plan, including nuclear energy, space, and earthquake predicition. This is our new position and priority direction of scientific and technological cooperation.

Northeast Asia

Security in Northeast Asia, Region Viewed

SK1406110690 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Commentary from the "Focus on Asia" program by station commentator (Mikhailov): "On Soviet-Chinese Negotiations Over the Asian-Pacific Question"]

[Text] Soviet-Chinese negotiations, the first of their kind to discuss the Asian-Pacific question, have been held in Beijing according to the protocol signed for consultation between the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministries.

At the negotiations, the two sides exchanged views on military, political, and economic matters, including the general situation in the Asian-Pacific region.

Our station commentator (Mikhailov) says:

The meeting held in Beijing between Foreign Ministry delegates of the two countries was a practical embodiment of the agreement reached when Chinese State Council Premier Li Peng visited Moscow. During his visit to Moscow, a protocol was signed for consultation between the Soviet and Chinese foreign ministries. At that time, the foreign ministers of the two countries agreed on regularly exchanging their views on important international issues and bilateral issues and on informing one another of their positions on international affairs.

Confrontation and the lack of dialogue, which lasted for several decades between the Soviet Union and China, had seriously affected the peoples of other Asian countries as well. Tension in the relations between the two had been transmitted directly and indirectly to other countries and other regions, causing arms races and conflicts. The ripples of Soviet-Chinese confrontation reached such fringes of the Asian-Pacific region as Afghanistan and Indochina.

Thus, today, it is no wonder that the normalization of the Soviet-Chinese relations is followed by considerable progress in strengthening security in this region. I do not think that anyone would deny the linkage between the normalization of amicable Soviet-Chinese relations and the active effort in settling the Cambodian question.

Today, the gap between the stand of the two countries over the two international issues, for instance, the Asian-Pacific question, is being narrowed. As proof, I would say that, at the United Nations, in recent years, the representatives of the two countries have invariably cast the same votes on 80 to 90 percent of the matters presented as agenda items.

The two sides are urging that measures be worked out to reduce the level of military confrontation and to intensify and develop multi-sided cooperation in the region.

Both the Soviet Union and China are calling for dialogue between North and South Korea. We know that it is impossible to achieve security in Northeast Asia without normalizing the situation on the Korean peninsula.

The scope of mutual understanding over the Cambodian question is expanding and the two countries support the plan for active UN intervention in settling the question.

Of course, there is a difference in views over some matters of the Asian-Pacific region. However, other things are important. Despite the difference, the two major Asian nations are actively seeking ways of cooperation to settle regional conflicts and to develop reciprocal cooperation in the region.

I think that regular Soviet-Chinese negotiation over the Asian-Pacific question will clearly contribute to settling those matters.

Deputy Minister Meets New Japanese Ambassador

OW1706020690 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] On 14 June, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister (Ovkhov) met with Japanese Ambassador to the Soviet

Union Sumio Edamura in connection with forthcoming ceremony for the ambassador to confer credentials .

Trade Ministers Conference Ends in Ulaanbaatar

LD1706014190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1313 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Ulaanbaatar, 16 Jun (TASS)—TASS correspondent Dugar Sanzhiyev reports:

The improvement of trade mechanisms, the implementation of achievements of scientific and technical progress in this field, and the exchange of goods were discussed by participants in the second meeting of leaders of ministries of trade of socialist countries, which finished its work here today. Representatives of Bulgaria, Hungary, Vietnam, the GDR, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, the Soviet Union, and Czechoslovakia took part in it.

Participants of the meeting were received by D. Byambasuren, the first deputy chairman of the MPR [Mongolian People's Republic] Council of Ministers, and chairman of the MPR State Committee on Social and Economic Development.

K.Z. Terekh, USSR minister of trade, was received by Sh. Gungaadorj, chairman of the MPR Council of Ministers.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Sino-Soviet Talks on Cambodia Examined

Nikolayev Commentary

BK1706035690 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Aleksey Nikolayev commentary]

[Text] Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev has pointed out the possibilities for a mutual contribution [words indistinct] in the near future. Comrade Rogachev made this statement during a press conference in Beijing after ending his talks with Chinese officials.

It is true that except for the Cambodian people themselves, no one has the right to settle the internal aspects of the Cambodian problem. The developments of the 11-year conflict are clear proof of this, our commentator Comrade Aleksey Nikolayev wrote. However, many countries have become involved in this matter for different reasons. These involved parties have helped, to a certain extent, to normalize the situation in this region. The Soviet Union and China are among these countries.

Even before totally normalizing their bilateral relations, the two countries have dedicated their efforts to this matter by exchanging views with each other. In the joint communique issued following the Sino-Soviet summit meeting, the two sides expressed their desire to help settle the Cambodian problem correctly and quickly through political means.

The past year was marked by a number of important steps on the road toward peace in Cambodia. These steps include the withdrawal of Vietnamese troops from Cambodia, the talks on the Cambodian problem in Paris and Jakarta, the UN participation in the search for a solution, and the meetings of the warring Cambodian factions with an aim toward mutual concessions, particularly the Tokyo meeting during which Comrade Hun Sen and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk signed a joint communique calling for a cease-fire in Cambodia.

Certainly, there are many more things to be done in order to end the war, such as the establishment of a supreme national council of Cambodia comprising representatives of the present government in Phnom Penh and those of the coalition government. It is certain that the formation of this council will be the foundation for reconciliation in Cambodia. This supreme national council will run the country during the transitional period. It will represent the Cambodian people at the United Nations and symbolize Cambodia's sovereignty and unity. Another thing to be done is to divide the duty of the council and that of the UN authority which will organize and supervise the elections in the country. Most importantly, the countries supporting the warring Cambodian factions should reach an agreement on the suspension of military aid.

During his talks on Cambodia with the Chinese side in Beijing, Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Comrade Igor Rogachev said that the time has come to put an end to this protracted conflict. Although Moscow and Beijing still have different views on several matters, we are both glad to see that the more the two sides meet, the more understanding they reach.

Rogachev Expects More Talks

BK1506130990 Moscow in Cambodian to Cambodia 1100 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Report on an interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev by Beijing-based PRAVDA correspondent, in Beijing, date not given]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] During my stay in Beijing, we also discussed the Cambodian problem. We agreed that the time has come to close the books on the protracted issue, that is to resolve the complicated conflict through a comprehensive political solution. On this point, however, we were still not able to reach a total agreement. But, at the same time, we did believe that provided we frequently meet, our positions will come closer. I think that in the near future, probably before the end of the year, we will be able to fight off all the obstacles in the way to a settlement of the Cambodian problem.

Ferrous Metallurgy Protocol Signed with India

LD1506141790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0818 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Delhi, 15 Jun (TASS)—The 11th session of the Soviet-Indian working group on ferrous metallurgy, which operates as part of the Soviet-Indian commission for economic, scientific, and technical cooperation, has closed here with the signing of a protocol which provides for a broadening of cooperation in ferrrous metallurgy.

Among other questions which are reflected in this document are an appraisal of the present state of bilateral cooperation in ferrous metallurgy, which is deemed to be satisfactory, and also the long-term trends of the future activation of interaction, in particular in establishing direct contacts between enterprises in the Indian state sector, private firms, and Soviet organizations.

It was pointed out at the protocol signing ceremony that much work is still to be done, but there is a good basis, which has been laid down by the long-term cooperation between Soviet and Indian metallurgists, for the implementation of this.

The next session of the Soviet-Indian working group on ferrous metallurgy will take place in Moscow next year.

Near East & South Asia

Prisoner of War Released in Afghanistan

LD1606125290 Moscow TASS in English 1204 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Kabul June 16 TASS—A Soviet prisoner of war was handed in to Soviet authorities in the Afghan Foreign Ministry today.

Speaking at the ceremony, Deputy Afghan Foreign Minister Daud Kawiani said that the Afghan leadership is doing all it can to help the release of Soviet soldiers captured by the rebels.

Pavel Shetko, a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of the parliamentary committee of soldiers-internationalists, and Valeriy Ochirov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Defence and State Security, who arrived in Kabul for the occasion, thanked the Afghan government for their efforts in releasing Soviet soldiers.

The prisoner of war, Nurmomad Khadimuradov, an ethnic Uzbek from Kashkadarya region, thanked the Afghans for assisting his release.

Circumstances of Il-76 Accident in Kabul Unknown

PM1506203190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by B. Pipiya under the rubric "Reporting Details": "Incidents. Six Minutes Before Landing"]

[Text] An Uzbek Civil Aviation Administration Il-76 transporter en route from Tashkent to Kabul landed between the landing strip and the taxiways without lowering its landing gear. What happened? I.Ye. Mashkivskiy, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers State Commission for Oversight of Aircraft Safety, answered this question at the request of PRAVDA's correspondent.

[Mashkivskiy] The aircraft set course for Kabul 12 June at 0330 hours Moscow time, with 50 tonnes of kerosene on board. The flight went normally. Some 90 minutes later, the Il-76 began to reduce altitude in order to come in to land. Suddenly the crew members heard a sharp bang. Immediately followed by a "pain in the ears"—the sign of momentary decompression in the aircraft. It soon became clear that a hole 1.5-2 meters large had developed in the port side of the fuselage. The engines on the left wing began to die, the instruments broke down, and the hydraulic system was disabled. The high-lift devices and the landing gear could not be activated for landing.

The airfield was still some 10 km away. Radio communications blacked out and it was not possible to inform ground services of what had happened. The crew then made the only correct decision: They put the heavily-laden aircraft down on its fuselage, with its landing gear retracted. Two crew members sustained slight bruises, the remaining members are safe and sound.

First pilot A. Kasatkin displayed eminent flying skill in a very complex situation. Here are a few words about him. Aleksandr Kirillovich is a leading pilot-inspector from the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation Flight Service Main Administration. He began flying 30 years ago. He began on a PO-2 (an "old crate") and learned to handle all kinds of aircraft. He has more than 15,000 flying hours to his credit. V. Gresko, deputy commander of the Tashkent Air Detachment, who was on board, along with second pilot A. Fomenko, navigator A. Grachko, flight engineer V. Cheremnykh, and radio operator V. Motarevich also distinguished themselves in the emergency situation.

One of the suggested causes of the accident is that the aircraft was shot by a "surface-to-air" missile. A USSR State Committee for Oversight of Aircraft Safety Commission will establish the precise circumstances behind the incident.

KGB Official on Afghan Border Situation

LD1506155790 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Today we complete a series of items about the situation along the Soviet-Afghan border. The following interview has been granted to our special correspondent, Valeriy Chebotaryev, by the chairman of the State Security Committee of the Soviet Central Asian republic of Tajikistan; Vladimir Petkel.

Special services of the enemy that have lately stepped up their activities to a great extent are trying to exert influence on the development of the political situation in the region as a whole, says the KGB official. They vowed to destabilize the situation, to have the Central Asian republics break away from the Soviet Union and to establish the so-called independent Muslim states on their territory.

Vladimir Petkel has given some facts to highlight the activities of foreign special services against the Soviet Central Asian republic. He said this in particular:

The republic's KGB has gleaned reliable data that large amounts of anti-Soviet brochures and leaflets of pan-Islamic nature, as well as arms and ammunition are supplied from Pakistan to the provinces of Afghanistan controlled by the armed opposition and neighbouring on Tajikistan. Channels are sought to move these materials to our territory illegally. Special schools are being set up for hostile activities against the USSR in the border provinces of Afghanistan. Under the guidance of instructors from intelligence centers, young people are trained at these schools in espionage and sabotage in the spirit of militant Islam. The young people are told to fight for the liberation of their brothers in faith in the Soviet Union.

The Tajik KGB leader quoted information that was obtained from a Pakistani agent, (Makhti Argul), seized by the Afghan security service:

During an interrogation, said Vladimir Petkel, the agent said that the aim of the sabotage group he was a member of was to study the hydrological situation along the Amu-Darya river to find places convenient for crossing it and for placing land mines as well as for committing other acts of sabotage and to choose positions from which it would be highly effective to shell Soviet territory with rockets.

The KGB official also spoke about the work of another Pakistani spy, (Dovlatov), who was caught on the territory of Tajikistan:

Vladimir Petkel said that the goal of this spy was to commit acts of sabotage and terror to set up caches of arms and food and to draw young men into subversive activities. About 20 Soviet young people were to have been selected here for illegal dispatch across the border to Afghanistan. They would have been trained there and sent back to Tajikistan. Later specially trained agents were to have ensured contact for the spy (Dovlatov) with the intelligence center which would have supplied him with cash and means for subversive activity.

It is clear from what the chairman of Tajikistan's KGB, Vladimir Petkel, has said that all measures are being taken in the Republic to normalize the local situation including that along the border with Afghanistan.

Iranian Opposition's Political Freedom Viewed

NC1706143790 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Esteemed listeners. According to the KEYHAN newspaper in Tehran, security forces have arrested some members of the overt opposition groups headed by former Prime Minister Mehdi Bazargan, including Mehdi Bazargan's son and some of his associates. KEYHAN says these persons have been charged with having close links to foreign forces opposed to the regime.

Nearly a month ago, 90 Iranian liberal figures who played a conspicuous role in the 1979 revolution sent an open letter to Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, demanding the restoration of the rights envisioned in the Constitution, and accusing the government of jeopardizing (?civic) freedom.

This open letter, which included Mehdi Bazargan's signature, stated that all you have given the impoverished ones is slogans and hunger. The reaction of Tehran official circles to this message was very severe and unexpected. 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani, the president of Iran, replied to this message: The liberals and other groups who are trying to bring about a confrontation with the government are politically bankrupt.

The recent arrests in Tehran came in the wake of the president's political remarks. The government has repeatedly eliminated its political opponents on pretexts of treachery and breach of promise. It would suffice to recall the fate of the Tudeh Party, or the Jebhe-ye Melli-ye Iran in this regard.

Until a few months ago, the trend of the political atmosphere which had evolved in the aftermath of the Iran-Iraq war seemed to be conducive to opposition criticism of the government. Officials stated that (?some of) the political parties would be free to engage in political activity. Mehdi Bazargan's supporters immediately took advantage of this opportunity and resumed their activities.

However now, it now seems that the announcement was largely (?misleading). The arrest of some of the liberals of the opposition indicate that now, as before, there is no provision for (?definite) legal guarantees and real freedom for the operation of political parties. After all, people know that freedom means being able to express one's beliefs and opinions, and to defend viewpoints which may differ from the official stances.

The government has not ensured any such possibilities. It is natural that under such conditions the opposition groups are not in a hurry to express their views and opinions. The arrest of some of Bazargan's associates, once again, indicates that any doubts on the part of the opposition about the truth of officials' statements on political freedom in Iran are not unfounded.

The recent events are evidence that a wide chasm exists between the issuing of an announcement on the freedom of political parties to operate and the practical implementation of this announcement. As events show, this chasm has not been bridged.

Iran-Iraq Relations Seen as 'Fragile'

NC1506185490 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] According to reports from New York, UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar met with Iran and Iraq's representatives in the United Nations. Perez de Cuellar's spokesman said that during the course of these talks, the latest developments in the relations between the two countries and the UN role in resolving the Iran-Iraq dispute were assessed.

According to the recently initiated tradition, detailed reports on Iran-Iraq consultations under the aegis of the United Nations have not been placed at the disposal of the correspondents. The UN spokesman, Francois Guiliani gave very scant information to the correspondents on talks held in New York. He informed them that on 12 June, Perez de Cuellar met the Iraqi representative and on 13 June he held talks with Kamal Kharrazi in the United Nations. According to Guiliani, the two sides were to have discussed the UN secretary general's visit to Iran and Iraq.

The UN secretary general's spokesman said that the perspective on such a visit is very favorable, but a specific plan has not been formulated. As was announced earlier, Tehran had invited Perez de Cuellar to visit both countries in order to control the implementation of the Resolution 598. However, Iraq had not acquiesced to this proposal.

Meanwhile, the Iran-Iraq ties unexpectedly took a turn for the worse. On 12 June, Commodore Shamkhani, the Iranian naval commander, warned that Iran would prevent any attempts by the Iraqi Italian-made warship to cross the Persian Gulf. In an interview with ETTELA'AT, Commodore Shamkhani said that Iranian submarines will be stationed in the Persian Gulf. 'Ali Shamkhani claimed that Iraq is violating international maritime law.

As far as is known, the warmongering allegations of the Iranian naval commander may inflict a blow to the trend of normalization of relations between Iran and Iraq. It can easily be imagined what the situation would be if Baghdad makes any attempts to have its warships cross the Strait of Hormuz.

We feel that at such a critical moment the two sides should exercise maximum restraint and should not fan the flames of their sentiments. At present, the ceasefire between Iran and Iraq is so fragile that verbal recriminations could be transformed into artillery fire. In such circumstances, the mediator can play a very important part.

We know that at present, three different forces, the United Nations, Moscow, and most of the Arab Gulf Cooperation Council countries are simultaneously playing the role of mediators between Tehran and Baghdad.

It is well-known that their general obligation is to create conditions for high-level contacts between Iran and Iraq, to which both the countries have declared their concurrence, in principle. If such a meeting is convened, it could possibly bring about fundamental changes in relations between the two countries. Probably, the Iran-Iraq leaders should not refrain even from indirect talks, as talks have brought home the fact that the days for a peace accord are not too far away.

Creation of Islamic Common Market Viewed

NC1606131090 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1500 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Reports received from Islamabad indicate that Ghulam Ishaq Khan, Pakistan's foreign minister, is to visit Iran and Turkey in mid-July. IRNA reports that during the talks, the establishment of stronger economic and political relations among the three countries will be discussed. Our analyst Yuriy Andreyev comments on this report and writes:

It is now clear that despite the completely obvious inclination of Turkey and Pakistan toward the United States, Iran is trying to expand its economic and political relations with these countries. It was Iran who propounded an initiative on the resumption of the three countries' regional economic cooperation organization. The first session of this organization was held in Tehran in 1985.

As we know, as a result of the Iran-Iraq war, the Islamic government found itself isolated from the majority of Arab nations, and this resulted in Iran's search for the consolidation of relations of non-Arab countries and, first and foremost, with Pakistan and Turkey.

It is not a secret to anyone that the Islamic fanaticism of the first years of the Iranian revolution terrified most of the moderate Islamic regimes. As a result, Tehran found itself in splendid isolation on the international scene, and for some time it was out of the process of the economic convergence in the Islamic world.

But this situation could not have continued forever, and life itself forces Iran to coordinate its economic policy with the other Islamic countries. Iran's emergence from its splendid isolation was in conjunction with the intensification of convergence processes inside the Islamic world.

As we know, the Islamic nations have many rich natural resources with 72 percent of the world's oil, 77 percent of the rubber, 66 percent of spices, 40 percent of jute, and a large number of other items of vital importance are produced there. Moreover, Islamic countries have considerable material and human resources. Presently almost all Islamic countries are taking steps toward economic convergence. Moreover, the plan for the creation of a common market for Islamic countries has been prepared. This plan envisages the lifting of custom obstacles and the establishment of a free commercial system in the Islamic world.

But these programs are still very far from reality. Today the Islamic world has been divided into several large economic centers as before with the Persian Gulf Cooperation Council and the Islamic countries in south Asia being among these centers. It is not at all impossible that another important economic center in the Islamic world which would unite Iran, Pakistan, and Turkey will be created now. At least Tehran, Islamabad, and Ankara are doing their best to expand and to consolidate their relations. But the situation does not have only one dimension. There are several unsolved political and economic problems in these countries, and the future will show whether they can solve these problems through talks or not.

Gorbachev Greets Israeli Communist Party Leaders

LD1606123190 Moscow TASS in English 1226 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev congratulated Israeli Communist Party Chairman Meir Vilner and General Secretary Taufiq Toubi on their election, wishing them success their work for the benefit of the Israeli people and for peace and socialism.

UN Visit to Israel 'Designed To Calm Fears'

TA1506200490 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Dmitriy Prokofyev commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] The first (?achievement) of the Shamir government in the international arena was apparently designed to calm fears in Israel and throughout the world. Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir announced that he would agree to a visit by Jean-Claude Aimee, the special envoy of the UN Secretary General, to Israel and to the territories in order to analyze [words indistinct] and submit a report to the international community.

Appearing before the Knesset, Mr. Shamir emphasized that this change in the position taken by the Israeli leadership can be explained as a gesture of good will and a readiness to cooperate constructively to further the peace process. Here is our correspondent Dmitriy Prokofyev's commentary on the subject:

The new Israeli government began its international activity with a move long demanded by the international community. Mr. Shamir is an experienced politician. He well understood that something had to be done to prevent a falling out with the UN, Egypt, and primarily with the U.S. Administration. Reports in this vein coming from [words indistinct] official circles in Washington repeatedly made it clear to the Israeli government that they would not allow it to block the furthering of the peace process. Israel's consent to the visit by the UN secretary general's special envoy was the minimum [word indisinct] to soothe the United States—even if just temporarily—and show the Americans, together with the rest of the international community, that Mr. Shamir is ready to cooperate. However, it would be unwise to exaggerate the importance of the step taken by the prime minister. After all, the fact that Jean-Claude Aimee will once more be convinced that the intifadah continues unabated will ultimately not lead to any practical changes. One should not hope that this visit will in itself cause any real progress in the political process in the region. The day-to-day steps adopted by the new Israeli government in the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip are certainly much more important from the perspective of resolving the conflict. In this domain, at least three factors bear witness to the fact that moving the peace process forward has now become much more difficult than it was under the previous government. The new defense minister, Moshe Arens, began his new job with a visit to the occupied territories, where he promised the settlers that the central role of the Army, after the repulsion of foreign invaders, would be to prevent any instability in the situation of the settlements.

Construction and Housing Minister Ari'el Sharon, who also holds the post of chairman of the interministerial committee dealing with the absorption of new immigrants, intends to register [word as heard] hundreds of empty apartments in the settlements in the territories in order to settle new immigrants there [words indistinct].

The Tehiya Party's Yuval Ne'eman, energy and infrastructure, science and techology minister, announced that he intends to renew the Mediterranean-Dead Sea Canal project. This project, as is known, calls for the expropriation of land in the Judean Desert, the West Bank, and the submerging of thousands of hectares in Jordan.

The reaction of the Arab states and the Palestinians will not be late in coming. The tension within the occupied territories, and within Israel, will grow. The very possibility that some form of negotiations may take place will be in danger.

And this is where the question crops up: Maybe this is the strategic plan of the government headed by the Likud and by the extreme right-wing hawks. After all, in such a case, Israel will be able to blame the Arabs for adopting an inflexible position, and for being unwilling to cooperate—and for the umpteenth time to lead the political process into a dead end.

East Europe

Tension Growing in Bucharest's University Square

LD1706212190 Moscow TASS in English 1813 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Vadim Malyutin]

[Text] Bucharest June 17 TASS—Protesters chanting "Down with the government" and "(President Ion) Iliescu should be tried for the bloodshed" filled University Square in downtown Bucharest by 1800 today.

The square had been guarded by the Army after recent dramatic events.

Hundreds of by[illegible] are watching the developments.

Military policemen, rushed to the scene, entered into negotiations with the protesters, which, however, proved unsuccessful.

Troops, who had earlier cordoned off the square, have gathered outside the university building, without interfering in the developments.

Passers-by, who call on the protesters to disperse, are booed off the square.

The situation on the square is growing more and more tense.

Romanian Ministry Criticized for Non-Action

LD1706131290 Moscow TASS in English 1305 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Dyakov]

[Text] Bucharest June 17 TASS—Romania's law inforcement bodies and the Interior Ministry were indecisive in restoring order in Bucharest during demonstrations on June 13 and failed to resist the aggressive crowd on the University Square, the Romanian Government said in a statement released by the ROMPRES Agency on Saturday.

A careful and attentive analysis of the events of the day leads to the conclusion that the extremists acted according to a pre-planned scenario to destabilise the situation in Romania and carry out a government coup. The fact that attacks were made predominantly against law enforcement bodies and democratic institutions formed as the result of May 20 elections proves just that.

Popular support to the police and army reduced the size of damage which is yet considerable. The government denies any actions contradicting Romanian laws and expresses its regret over the fact that innocent people, not involved in the events, were beaten up in the process of restoring order on June 14-15, the statement said.

More than 1,000 demonstrators, including 51 teenagers, were detained in the days of disturbances. Criminal proceedings have been launched against 83, and 155 were fined.

The Romanian Government is determined to ensure the freedom of political views in Romania, without any extremist or neofascist propaganda. It demanded from all leaders to ensure a free functioning of democratic institutions, the press, the radio and television and suggested getting down to the preparation of several laws, including the one on the press.

13-14 Jun Violence Spreads to Other Cities

PM1606213190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Volodin under the rubric "Panorama of International Life": "Bucharest: Miners Leave the City"]

[Text] Bucharest, Jun—Life in Bucharest is returning to normal. But in the morning the groups of miners who had come to the Romanian capital were still patroling Aviators' Highway, which leads to the television building which was ransacked by demonstrators: They stopped passing vehicles and checked the owners' documents and luggage. After midday the miners lifted the cordons they had mounted and the 10,000-strong army began leaving the city where, since 13 June, 467 people have been reported injured and 5 dead.

The events of the past few days are still being discussed by residents of Bucharest in the streets, in the city's transport, and in University Square which is completely surrounded by armed police. The capital's political circles are expressing widely varying opinions. A communique by the National Liberal Party says that the government's brutal measures against the demonstrators who were blockading University Square drove them to violence. The National Liberals consider the call to the miners to come to Bucharest a display of weakness on the part of the country's leadership.

"A hoax in the spirit of the Ceausescu regime," was how the statement by the National Peasants' Party described the petrol bombs, weapons, and drugs discovered at its headquarters. Incidentally, the rumors which circulated around the city that Ion Raciu, a parliamentary deputy from the National Peasants' Party and a recent contender for the Romanian presidency, had been arrested and murdered, have not been substantiated.

Newspapers such as DREPTATEA, organ of the National Peasants' Party, BARRICADI, ROMANIA LIBERA, and a number of other publications are not taking part in the discussions. As I was told at the ROMANIA LIBERA editorial office, its publication was temporarily halted on Thursday at the demand of the miners, who believe that this newspaper regularly published materials of a inflammatory and antigovernment character. It is not only the miners who think that way. On the same day a demonstration by print workers under the slogan "We won't print you!" was held in front of the House of the Press, where the largest publishing committee in Romania is housed. This radical statement by the demonstrators was prompted by reaction to the aforementioned newspapers' publication of a subversive article which played its role in the events of 13 June.

Statements from various political parties, trade unions, and social organizations in the country which are continuing to reach Bucharest express support for the measures taken by the government to thwart the right wing forces' attempts to install a fascist-type regime in Romania. Against this background, however, the demands from social organizations to end the persecution of intellectuals and stop the violence is a clear response to the miners' actions in the capital. An appeal broadcast on Romanian Central Television by the democratic union "Romov" ("Gypsy") points out that in the past few days thousands of gypsies and their homes in various parts of Bucharest have been attacked on the pretext of combating speculation. The pogrom, in which there have been casualties, the document says, is aimed at pinning the blame for the 13 June events on citizens of gypsy nationality. Like many other appeals broadcast these days on Romanian television, it contains a call for tolerance.

Meanwhile, the violence of the days has been seen not only in the streets of Bucharest. Extremism also erupted in the city of Miercurea Ciuc in Harghita region where the population is predominantly Romanian citizens of Hungarian nationality. During the night of 13-14 June more than 1,000 demonstrators there besieged and then seized the municipal police administration where they committed a pogrom. Now the situation in Miercurea Ciuc is being controlled by troops, and infantry combat vehicles are guarding the municipal police administration building. As in Bucharest, life in this small town is returning to normal.

Bucharest 'Remains Tense' After 14 Jun 'Anarchy'

PM1506113790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1,6

[TASS report: "Tank Cordons in Streets"]

[Text] The consequences of the anarchy which reigned in the streets of Bucharest throughout the past night can still be felt. Traffic in the city center has been completely disrupted, public transport is not working, and thousands of people are converging on the capital's police headquarters, the Ministry of Interior, and the television center to see the scene of yesterday's dramatic events. The streets are littered with dozens of burned-out cars, trucks, and buses.

Miners who have arrived in Bucharest from various parts of the country, in their working clothes and steel helmets, faces black with coal dust, are in evidence everywhere. They are guarding the city's main installations, detaining people who, in their opinion, are suspect, and handing them over to the law-enforcement forces.

In the yard of the police building ,where fire fighters are putting out isolated fires, a kind of law enforcement headquarters has been set up. The entire area has been encircled by army units and tank cordons. Every few minutes miners bring in suspects from various parts of the city who, according to their testimony, took part in yesterday's acts of street vandalism. They have to make their way through crowds of citizens who have gathered on the approaches and who try to attack the detainees, shouting "Death to the bandits and pogromists!"

The situation in the city remains tense. In the vicinity of the headquarters of the National Liberal Party and the National Peasant (Christian Democratic) Party, which have been burned down by the miners, bloody clashes flare up from time to time.

A government report circulated today states that as a result of the acts of aggression during the night of 13-14 June there have been casualties and considerable material damage. As of 0800 hours in the morning, local time, the toll stood at 4 dead and 104 injured, of whom 60 have been hospitalized. Considerable damage has been inflicted to the premises of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the city police headquarters, the television center, and adjoining stores. The report notes the low professionalism of the police when putting down the acts of lawlessness.

Law enforcement forces have arrested many of those who took part in the disturbances. During the suppression of extremist actions, the report says, a cache of petrol bombs, ammunition, and drugs was discovered in the cellar of the headquarters of the National Peasant (Christian Democratic) Party.

According to eye-witness accounts, matrices for printing counterfeit money have been found at the headquarters of the National Liberal Party.

Work to clear the main transport routes is under way at the scene of last night's main events. The city authorities are finding it hard to cope with this task because of the lack of special equipment to remove burned-out vehicles.

The television complex has suffered considerable fire damage, estimated at four to five million leu. The movie library in particular has suffered. Some 200,000 films have been destroyed. At present the television center is entirely under the control of the Armed Forces and broadcasts have resumed. The government has requested the army to remain in key areas in the city and to be prepared to put down any act of violence.

Groups of workers from the capital's "23 August," "Vulkan," and other enterprises are roaming the city's streets chanting "Down with the legionnaires and fascists!" "Down with the vandals!" "Punish the criminals!" A big rally has been held in Victory Square. President I. Iliescu addressed those present from a balcony. He thanked the miners for their assistance in establishing order and called on them to contribute to a peaceful return to work in the country.

Describing the goals of yesterday's disturbances in Bucharest, the Romanian president stressed that the extremists had tried to establish the rule of right-wing forces in the country. On this occasion these elements were better organized than previously, they included trained legionnaire-type formations, and were inspired by right-wing extremist forces inside the country and abroad.

Certain politicians and journalists, Iliescu went on, are trying to distort the facts and put the blame on law-enforcement organs and the government. If these organs and the government are to be blamed for anything, it is that they tolerated the excesses and violence for too long. Iliescu expressed regret in connection with the delayed intervention by the law-enforcement organs.

According to Romanian television, Minister of the Interior M. Chitac has been relieved of his post by presidential decree today. Doru Viorel Ursu has been appointed to this post. He is 37, and he was prosecutor at the trial of former state security staffers in the city of Sibiu.

Romanian Miners' Acts 'Reminiscent of Mass Terror'

PM1506211390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent V. Volodin: "Miners in Bucharest. How Order Was Restored in the Capital's Streets"]

[Text] Bucharest—Bucharest presents a sorry sight now. The burned out buildings of Bucharest Police Headquarters and the Central Internal Affairs Inspectorate and the wrecked headquarters of the National Salvation Front and the National Peasants and National-Liberal Parties have added to the destruction left over from the December events. Fresh bullet holes have appeared in the walls of houses in the area of Army House, where the rebels opened fire on the night of 14 June.

Police patrols, tanks, and groups of miners who arrived in Bucharest at dawn yesterday to support the government—which was reeling under the blow inflicted by the extremists—surrounded the block containing the wrecked Ministry of Internal Affairs building. The burned out shells of buses, trucks, and charred police vehicles were hurriedly cleared from University Square and the adjacent streets. The square is once again open to traffic.

...Whereas the flames licking at furniture that had been hurled out of the windows at the National Liberals' headquarters were subsiding, I saw a picture of utter chaos at the National Peasants Party building, cordoned off by miners: broken glass and piles of smashed typewriters, photocopiers, and display screens. A police lieutenant who came to investigate said that weapons and petrol bombs were discovered at the headquarters of the National Peasants Party.

"Who carried out the pogrom," I asked a miner called Gheorghe Petre.

"Civilians," he answered briefly, adding that thousands of miners have come to Bucharest to restore order there.

The capital, where many people welcomed the arrival of the large detachment of miners in the early morning, soon sensed their insuperable desire to cleanse Bucharest of all filth. These people, who claimed that the city of 2 million was on the brink of a civil conflict, proved to be right. In my view, the past day and night have only deepened the previous split, sowing the seeds of future wrath in the hearts of a multitude of people. One cannot justify the rebels' actions, which I described in detail yesterday, but what I saw in Bucharest after the situation had changed arouses feelings quite far removed from sympathy.

Virtually the whole city center was farmed out to thousands of miners. While some people were driving around Bucharest, clinging to the bodies of refuse trucks and chanting "Iliescu! The miners are with you!", others broke up into groups and set about "cleaning up" the city. No speculators or professional barbut (a kind of dice game) players, who had swamped University Square of late, were to be seen there any longer. However, many passersby soon began to bypass the miners wearing helmets and armed with axes, scraps of cable, rubber hoses with metal nuts at the end, and just hefty cudgels. Without going against my conscience, I will say that hundreds of townspeople felt the force of their blows when the miners set about restoring order, using methods that were extremely reminiscent of mass terror.

I witnessed numerous beatings near the university's faculty of architecture. I saw a girl who had been beaten up writhing hysterically, a young man crossing himself as he managed by chance to avoid reprisals, and gypsies screaming in fear as they were carted toward police vehicles.

The police are now under our jurisdiction, I was told by a young miner lying down on the sidewalk, turning passersby away with the words: "Back; no entry." Of course, no one even thought of placing the miners above the organs safeguarding order, but during the past day I frequently saw that the police are afraid of them.

I could give an infinitely long list of everything that I witnessed in Bucharest's streets, where some people spent the whole day establishing order and ripping the film out of journalists' cameras, others crying, and yet others applauding and chanting: "Honor and glory to the miners!" Words of gratitude were addressed to the miners from the balcony of the government residence and it was emphasized that the enemies had finally felt the force of Romanian democracy.

With nightfall the lights of the miners' lamps began to glimmer in the streets adjacent to the IZVESTIYA office. Sealing off one street, they stopped passing vehicles, inspected baggage, searched a few passersby, and checked their papers. Thus ended a day of stormy events, during which few people paid attention to the government announcement of the resignation of Internal Affairs Minister M. Ghitac, something that the demonstrators in University Square had doggedly tried to secure. The 37-year old prosecutor Doru Viorel Ursu has been appointed in his stead.

West's Sympathy With Bucharest Miners Cited

LD1606093490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0400 GMT on 16 June carries a three-minute commentary by Konstantin Patsyuk on the situation in Romania.

Noting that "in recent days the most turbulent events in Eastern Europe have taken place in Bucharest," Patsyuk reports that the situation is returning to normal and "the miners, who arrived there to provide assistance to the government and army and police forces in restoring order, are leaving the city." He quotes Prime Minister Roman's press conference, to the effect that Bucharest has not seen such excesses for 40-50 years. Still citing Roman, he states that "extremist bands" attacked key state installations, acting in a totally organized way; the protesters on University Square were "ready to act against the government," and included "speculators, beggars, and prostitutes." The miners were only in Bucharest to "ensure calm and order on University Square during the work to clear it," Patsyuk says. He mentions Roman's "regret" at "certain unpleasant incidents."

Patsyuk continued: "Judging by reports reaching us at the editorial office, representatives of the major Western states not only sympathize with the extremists, who carry the responsibility for the dramatic events in Bucharest, but are also threatening Romania with sanctions."

He says that the United States is reconsidering nonhumanitarian aid and the EC commission is to suspend the ratification of the initialed trade agreement.

Patsyuk concludes: "The commission has stated that it is shocked and disappointed by the violence employed by the Romanian government to break up the demonstration—as if it were not known who the true organizer of the disorders is."

Sympathy Termed 'Nonconstructive'

LD1506220490 Moscow TASS in English 2150 GMT 15 Jun 90

["Unrest in Romania—TASS comment"; by TASS observer Aleksandr Kondrashov]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The first response of many people to the developments in the Romanian capital is a feeling of regret over the unrest which led to the loss of life and considerable material damage. After truly democratic elections, held in a calm atmosphere, in which the National Salvation Front won an impressive victory, it was difficult to believe that the opposition would resort to massive street demonstrations. The elections showed that noisy protest rallies, sit-ins and other actions which are outside civilised political struggle are detrimental to the opposition parties, because they alienate from them the majority of the population.

Unfortunately, the forecasts that the opposition seeks to move the struggle from parliament to the streets proved to be true. The recent developments were, perhaps, the worst type of post-election confrontation, which undermined Romania's reputation in the world irrespective of who is to blame for them. The question arises: Is this development of events advantageous for the ruling National Salvation Front? The answer will be definitely no.

This is why some press reports and statements made in the West to the effect that the Romanian authorities provoked the unrest themselves look dubious. The chronology of the developments refutes these allegations. The Romanian authorities made countless attempts to remove protesters from the University Square, which they occupied for two months, paralysing the life of the city's centre.

It is clear to all unbiassed observers that it is not the government, but the protesters who were interested in worsening the situation, using any pretext. It is not law inforcement agencies whose actions were reserved, if not passive, but crowds of extremists burning cars and destroying police and Interior Ministry Buildings, who are to blame for what happened in Romania.

In this situation one could hardly find anything wrong in the arrival of thousands of mineworkers to Bucharest. They wished to support the authority which they consider theirs. One should bear in mind that students and other young people were not the only ones who took part in the December revolution, that they are not alone who are interested in the building of a new democratic Romania. It is the workers that ensured the successful overthrow of the totalitarian regime. At the most crucial moment they took to the streets, which decided the outcome of the uprising. If at present the aggressive minority, obviously supported by the right-wing forces, is trying to topple the legal authority which gained broad support during the elections, and the majority is defending it, the actions of the latter can hardly be described as anti-democratic. It is difficult to imagine that people would sympathise with anything like this, if it happened in any Western country, with a minority wrecking state offices after losing an election. Unfortunately, representatives of leading Western countries not only sympathize with the extremists, but even threaten Romania with sanctions. The non-constructive character of this stand is obvious.

Western Response Criticized

PM1706164190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Veniamin Shurygin "Observer's Opinion" under general heading of "Romania: Who Stands To Gain from This?" as part of a feature entitled "Eastern Europe: Is Democracy the Opposition's Aim?"]

[Text] The disorders in Romania and the national government's measures in response have aroused a broad response in the world. The U.S. Department of State reacted sharply to the events in Bucharest. A statement by a State Department spokesman calls on President Iliescu to "halt all actions aimed against the establishment of democracy...." It is also reported that the United States has decided to suspend examination of the question of granting nonhumanitarian aid to Romania. "Disappointment" at the Romanian leadership's activity in this regard has also been expressed by deputies of the European Parliament at a session of that Common Market consultative organ in Strasbourg. They are also threatening economic sanctions.

Where has the West seen a violation of the democratic process in Romania?

Certainly not in the events of 13-14 June, when armed gangs of extremists stormed the Bucharest TV Center and laid siege to government buildings with the clear intention of forcibly overthrowing the country's democratically elected leadership.

Washington and its allies were displeased by the miners who, seeing on television the outrages committed by extremists in the capital, rushed to the president's aid and helped the organs of law and order control the situation.

What is the reason for this double standard, to put it mildly, in the assessment of what is happening? The fact is that many influential circles in the West, impatient to "finish off communism" on a worldwide scale as soon as possible, would like events in all East European countries to develop in precisely this direction. As far as they are concerned, democracy is synonymous with anticommunism. That is why the actions of the extremists, who tried to nullify the results of the recent free multiparty elections, have aroused the sympathy of those circles.

Hungary's Fragmented Socialist Party Surveyed

PM1406124190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Own correspondent V. Gerasimov dispatch: "After the 'Explosion'"]

[Text] Budapest, June—I have observed so many meetings between two people who in the past were comrades in the same party, but now they do not give each other their hand or they pretend not to know each other.

Disunity—unfortunately, you have to use this word often when speaking of parties and movements representing left-wing trends in Hungary. It has come about, on the one hand, because of the collapse of "state socialism" and the one-party system and, on the other, literally because of the explosion of the old 850,000-strong MSZMP [Hungarian Socialist Workers Party].

It is difficult now to collect the fragments from that explosion into a single nucleus.

The MSZP [Hungarian Socialist Party], which emerged from the debris last October and now has barely 50,000 members, proclaimed in its program that it is "a left-wing socialist party, being the heir to fundamental socialist and communist values." But the Second MSZP Congress was held at the end of May this year, and a new explosion occurred: One part of the inheritance was abandoned—communist values.

"We honor the legacy of Marx, but we do not serve it slavishly. We love Marx, but we love the truth more," Ivan Vitanyi, one of the MSZP's chief ideologues, declared, meaning by the truth the fact that Marx' ideas have not been confirmed in practice.

In addition to the question of membership of the Socialist International (the MSZP is asking to be admitted as quickly as possible to this alliance of social democrats), the question of a new leadership arose. It was considered that MSZP Chairman Rezso Nyers and the other leaders had risen on a wave of compromise—between reformers and other platforms. But now that the departure from the "communist legacy" had been made, quite different people must lead the party. And on the first day of work the names of Gyula Horn, Imre Pozsgay, and Ivan Vitanyi appeared on stands in the lobby as possible candidates for MSZP chairman.

Gyula Horn received 65 percent of the congress delegates' votes. And he became the new chairman. Imre Pozsgay became his deputy and, at the same time, leader of the MSZP parliamentary faction. And Ivan Vitanyi became leader of the MSZP Board.

"For what has Rezso Nyers been punished?" journalists inquired.

"During his leadership disorganization was manifested in the party," Gyula Horn replied.

During the elections Horn laid down a condition: Either I or Nyers. The former MSZP chairman must quit the board altogether.

Gyula Horn is 58 years old. He is from a working-class family. In the early fifties he studied in the USSR, at Rostov Finance and Economics Institute. Later he became a candidate and then a doctor of economic sciences. He worked on the MSZMP Central Committee and at one time was head of the International Department. He moved to the Foreign Ministry. He was state secretary and, until recently, minister of foreign affairs. The new deputies have now elected him leader of the foreign commission of parliament.

After the radical changes last fall the MSZP was reckoning on remaining a mass party if at least one-third of the members of the old MSZMP joined it. But this did not happen. The logic of political dissension led both to clashes with those who did not recognize the decision of the extraordinary congress and held the 14th MSZMP Congress and to a confrontation with other left-wingers.

"Because of this we lost about 10 percent of the votes in the elections," congress delegate Matyas Szuros told me.

He is now deputy chairman of the Hungarian National Assembly. This is the highest post to go to the Socialists in the new state-administrative structure.

"A very important point is that the MSZP faction in parliament will now seek to represent all left-wing forces in the country," M. Szuros remarked.

There is a section of 33 seats in the semicircle of the parliamentary deputies' auditorium. This is 8.5 percent of the entire "horseshoe"—the section occupied by MSZP deputies. More than 500,000 people voted for them. And yet those voters cast their votes for a party which in its program stood for a "synthesis" of social democratic and communist values. What will their attitude be to the decision of the Second MSZP Congress?

Account must also be taken of the fact that before this there were three social democratic parties in Hungary. They all got just a few votes in the elections and did not get into parliament. And now a fourth one has been formed.

"The MSZP does not wish to squeeze out the already existing social democratic parties. 'One flock—one shepherd'—this principle does not apply. We will seek an alliance with all social democrats," Ivan Vitanyi explained the strategy.

But is the disrupted alliance with the renewed MSZMP being reestablished? It now has 82,000 members.

"We will arrange relations on the principles of peaceful coexistence," it is possible to hear Socialists say today.

The MSZMP Central Committee is now housed in a former regional committee building. Gyula Thurmer, the energetic young chairman of the workers party, as the masses are now increasingly frequently calling the MSZMP, has already done a great deal to renew its program and to make the party flexible and dynamic. A Central Committee plenum was held in May, and its decisions served the goals of rethinking party policy.

"In the course of the debate the Central Committee cut itself off from conservative views," the MSZMP chairman told me right after the plenum. "The fact that our party has not become a parliamentary party naturally gave rise to certain arguments. But shortcomings in organization came to the surface. Dogmatic opinions were also manifested, which would have hindered our progress. It was important to assess the situation in the country. We also carried out cadre reshuffles at the plenum."

Assessing the work of the Second MSZP Congress, Gyula Thurmer expressed regret that a shift toward social democracy occurred there. This runs counter to the ideas of many members of the MSZP itself. Their influx into our workers party is now to be observed, and this has to be taken into account.

"We still regard the MSZP as a potential ally with whom we would like to cooperate. And it is not our fault that there have not yet been talks on these questions. As regards 'peaceful coexistence,' this sounds strange. This concept is better suited to diplomacy."

The workers party has arranged cooperation with the Leftist Alternative movement, the Agrarian Union, and the Ferenc Munnich Society. And, of course, the four social democratic parties (now also counting the MSZP), the two parties calling themselves communist, also the small youth unions, the trade union associations, and the various left-centrist groupings in the second largest parliamentary party in terms of the number of deputies—the Alliance of Free Democrats—all these must be placed in the left-hand pan of the scales. Left-wingers in Hungary today constitute multifaceted structures which get mixed up and clash but are not yet uniting. There are large conglomerates, and there are fragments and particles remaining from the explosion.

This lack of coordination will last a long time. Left-wing forces are powerless at present to overcome the current centrifugal "acceleration." But it will continue to determine the nature of the election campaigns and the distribution and directions of political trends.

Hungary Considers Withdrawal From Pact

PM1506202190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent V. Gerasimov: "Hungary: Are They Leaving the Warsaw Pact?"]

[Text] Budapest, 15 Jun—A draft decision adopted by the Hungarian State Assembly Foreign Affairs Commission says that "the parliament instructs the government to begin talks regarding Hungary's leaving the Warsaw Pact."

The draft also points out that it is desirable to reach agreement with all Warsaw Pact member states in order for this to occur. The document demands that the Hungarian Government's aim as a first step be the suspension of Hungary's involvement in the Warsaw Pact military organization, that the Hungarian Army take no part in joint maneuvers, and that Warsaw Pact troops conduct no exercises on Hungarian territory.

The draft proposes that the government begin talks on revising bilateral treaties on friendship, cooperation, and mutual assistance with Warsaw Pact member states. The commission's decision declares that the "Republic of Hungary wants to live in peace and friendship with all its neighbors and will not allow anyone to use its territory to attack or threaten to attack a third country."

Fuer Sets Date for Late 1991

LD1606154390 Moscow TASS in English 1534 GMT 16 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Smirnov]

[Text] Budapest June 16 TASS—Hungarian Defence Minister Lajos Fuer said Hungary will quit the Warsaw Treaty military organisation late in 1991. He said this in an interview to NEPSZABADSAG newspaper published under the heading: "Hungary No Longer Participates in Warsaw Treaty Military Exercises."

But this decision will not be a unilateral one. It will result from negotiations.

Hungary cannot quit the Warsaw Treaty military organisation at present. This step will become possible after the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe end, it was said in the interview.

Troop Withdrawal From Hungary Poses Problems

LD1606213190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; presented by Igor Fesunenko]

[Text] Vremya broadcast a report on 6 June by our correspondent in Budapest Yevgeniy Shirokov about the withdrawal of our troops from Hungary and problems arising therefrom. The point in particular was that many good-quality buildings erected there on our military compounds by our servicemen during their years there—and this property is reckoned to be worth around 1,000 million forints—these buildings are to remain or may remain on Hungarian territory after the withdrawal of our troops without any kind of compensation whatsoever.

After that report of 6 June I delivered a short rejoinder wondering why our Defense Ministry had not gone to the trouble at the proper time to establish conditions for the handover of such property. Well, we recently received a telegram from the Colonel General Burlakov, commander of the Southern Group of Troops, taking exception to this version of the issue and considering the censure of the Defense Ministry to be undeserved.

His telegram actually says, among other things, and I quote: The commission under the leadership of a USSR Government plenipotentiary, and with the most active participation by man and central directorates of the defense Ministry, are striving to resolve on a constructive footing all arising problems concerning calculations made by the Hungarian side. This represents the most difficult part of all of the work to fulfill the Soviet-Hungarian agreement on withdrawal of the troops.

We learn further from Col. Gen. Burlakov's telegram that the commission had come up against very tough positions taken on a number of questions, on a number of problems, by their counterparts in the talks.

Well, there we have it, Comrade Burlakov, and in my rejoinder on 6 June I said, and I can repeat it today, that if at the time—that is when our troops were moved into Hungary and indeed into many other allied countries—the conditions for their presence there and for their subsequent withdrawal had been agreed in document form, endorsed and enshrined in appropriate agreements envisaging precise conditions for compensation for property left behind, then if that had been done, Comrade Burlakov, your task today would be much easier.

But that is the failing of us Russians, that we somehow forget the folk wisdom concerning carts in winter and sleds in summer. My censure, Comrade Burlakov, was directed not at you or at Minister Yazov but at your predecessors in the times of stagnation who, in moving our troops in such a cavalier fashion at that time into Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other countries, did not even take the time to consider that the time might come when they would have to be withdrawn. Well, all that remains now is to express the wish that you and your comrades might be successful in resolving your tricky tasks and putting right the errors of your predecessors.

Germany's NATO Membership Viewed Unacceptable

LD1506104790 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0921 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Moscow (ADN)—A united Germany's unilateral and full membership in NATO is unacceptable to the Soviet Union. Party for Democratic Socialism Chairman Gregor Gysi informed the press of this in Moscow today. It is his impression that this would not achieve a majority either in the Soviet leadership or in the USSR Supreme Soviet, said Gysi, who yesterday met senior politician Aleksandr Yakovlev. Questioned on possible Soviet measures to block an all-German NATO accession, the PDS leader referred to the rights of the allies over the whole of Germany. There is as yet no peace treaty and legally no way of sidestepping the victorious powers. In his talks in Moscow, he learned that the Soviet side is concerned that, in the case of a German incorporation into NATO, the USSR might be isolated, Gysi said. [passage omitted]

In connection with developments in the Baltic, Gysi said that problems of this kind should be resolved solely by political means. At the same time he did not rule out the possibility of contacts between his party and the independent communist parties of these republics. Relations between the PDS and the CPSU are not of an exclusive nature, Gysi said.

West Europe

Netherlands' Ter Beek Interviewed Prior to Visit

PM1706155390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Netherlands Defense Minister R. ter Beek by TASS correspondent S. Melnikov and APN correspondent L. Lipnyakov under the rubric "Interview on the Eve of a Visit": "R. ter Beek: 'NATO Must Adapt to the New Conditions'"]

[Text] The Hague, 14 Jun—The official visit to the Soviet Union by Netherlands Defense Minister Relus ter Beek begins 18 June. At KRASNAYA ZVEZDA's request, Soviet journalists accredited in The Netherlands interviewed the head of the Netherlands Military Department on the eve of his visit to the Soviet Union.

Question: What do you, as a minister, expect from your visit to the USSR?

Answer: This is not my first visit to the Soviet Union. I have visited your country several times as chairman of the Netherlands parliament's foreign affairs committee. This will be my first visit to the USSR as defense minister. I regard this visit as an historic milestone in relations between our countries because this is the first time that a leader of the Netherlands military department will be visiting the USSR at the invitation of his Soviet colleague.

Tremendous changes occurred in the East European countries and the Soviet Union last year. The Soviet troop withdrawal from East European countries that has begun, the prospect of the signing of the Vienna agreements, and the process of the unification of the two Germanies radically change the situation on the European continent and demands that the existing military-political structures and systems adapt to the new conditions. All these important problems will form the center of my visit to the USSR.

It is also proposed that specific agreements be signed with the Soviet side. This is the first time that a treaty to prevent incidents at sea outside territorial waters will be signed not by foreign ministers but by the leaders of the two countries' military departments. Another specific and important event in the realm of confidence-building measures will be the visit by a Netherlands naval squadron to Leningrad. And a particularly important and unprecedented aspect is that one of the ships from the squadron will be calling in at Kronshtadt.

Question: What role could The Netherlands play in resolving such a crucial question as the creation of new European security structures?

Answer: The Netherlands intends to play an active role in the solution of this problem. The Netherlands Government believes that NATO must adapt to the new conditions, which presupposes a revision of the bloc's strategy, structure, and level of armaments. When addressing various NATO forums recently I proposed the unilateral rejection of nuclear artillery and urged the Soviet Union to follow this example. The Netherlands also welcomed the allies' decision not to modernize the Lance tactical missile and said that it is necessary to open talks on the reduction of short-range nuclear weapons straight after the conclusion of the conventional arms accords in Vienna. I also believe that the NATO partners should discuss with the Soviet Union the so-called "minimum nuclear deterrence" concept.

Question: What place will united Germany occupy in the renewed Europe, in your opinion?

Answer: The Netherlands supports the German state's participation in NATO because that will make it possible to prevent the isolation of Germany. Its security is inseparable from that of the other European countries. That is our main argument in favor of united Germany's future participation in the North Atlantic alliance. At the same time, we believe that to maintain stability on the continent, the USSR's legitimate security interests must also be taken into account. On that basis it is necessary to seek mutually acceptable solutions.

Question: What spheres, in your view, are the most promising for further cooperation between the USSR and Netherlands defense ministries and between NATO and the Warsaw Pact as a whole?

Answer: The foundations of mutual relations between our countries' military departments have already been laid. There was a visit to The Netherlands by a Soviet military delegation headed by Army General Ye.F. Ivanovskiy, which presented examples of Soviet World War II military hardware to the National Museum of the War and the Resistance in Overloon. An exhibition entitled "We Remember," dedicated to the Soviet people's struggle against the Hitlerite occupiers and the USSR's role in Europe's liberation from fascism, was held successfully at the Dutch Defense Ministry's Information Center. There have also been exchanges of students from military colleges.

The time has also come to think about expanding sports, cultural, and general human contacts between our military servicemen.

Question: Mr. Minister, could you briefly tell our readers about yourself, your family, and your hobbies?

Answer: This may seem strange to you but believe me, I am a real sports fanatic. And I am serious about that! For example, when visiting the Soviet Union I always try to see a soccer match. About four years ago my hosts in Leningrad were absolutely astounded when instead of suggesting that we see the city's sights I persuaded them to show me... a covered stadium with a unique 333-meter ice track, which was really amazing because standard tracks even at open-air stadiums are 400 meters long. And this one 333 meters!

I am married. And I have true wealth: My two children. My son is 15, my daughter is 19. And I am very glad that they like sports, too. I am proud that my daughter is a member of the national golf team. We all live together in the small town of Coevorden, where, incidentally, I was born.

Latin America & Caribbean

Cuba's Viera Interviewed on Soviet Relations

PY1506232690 Moscow in Spanish to Cuba 0030 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Interview granted by Cuban First Vice Foreign Minister Jose Raul Viera to Radio Moscow commentator Vladimir Stigneyev—place, date not given]

[Text] [Stigneyev] How are the 30 years of Cuban-Soviet relations evaluated in Cuba?

[Viera] Well, for Cuba the relations with the Soviet Union have had a prominent state character and have played a decisive role. The Cuban revolution was made, thanks to the efforts of the Cuban people, and it is the result of their own effort. No doubt, without the opportune help of the Soviet Union and the support of the Soviet people, it would have been very difficult for our revolution to secure the country's independence and sovereignty, as well as its economic development during these 30 years. I believe that the change brought about by the October revolution opened new prospects for national struggles in the Third World. No doubt, the direct aid to the Cuban revolution that was implemented as soon as the United States imposed a blockade on oil supplies to Cuba and suspended the sugar quota the Cuban people used to export to the United States for many years helped. This double aggression had a response from us who decided to resist even without oil and sugar earnings, as well as from the Soviet Union who immediately opened a market for that sugar and guaranteed oil supplies to Cuba.

Moreover, I believe that the Soviet Union's aid to Cuba during these 30 years has had a broader repercussion, because it demonstrated that it was possible to carry out an anti-colonial revolution, to get free from imperialist rule, and to prove that we are not alone in the world. I believe that at the time of the Cuban revolution, our friendship with, and help from, the Soviet Union became a symbol for the possibility of carrying out a struggle for national independence and full sovereignty in the Third World. It destroyed the myth of geographical fatalism.

Lastly, the help during these 30 years allowed us to survive economically in the first moments, and to make continuous social and economic progress later. I believe that there is no sector of the economy in Cuba where there are no signs of Cuban-Soviet cooperation.

[Stigneyev] Comrade Viera, another question. Have there been new changes in these relations in the past five years, since perestroyka began in the Soviet Union. If the answer is yes, what are those changes?

[Viera] The changes that have been introduced in the management of the Soviet economy, its restructuring, and the difficult, tumultuous period the Soviet Union has entered upon in carrying out the reforms prescribed by the perestroyka, have had repercussions in the Soviet Union's relations with all other countries. In the case of Cuba, the repercussions are not politically negative. The Soviet Government has reiterated all these years its will to fulfill all the agreements and commitments with Cuba, on the Cuban side, the will to continue developing these relations has been reiterated.

Therefore, if these relations have in some way been affected, we would have to look into the consequences of the changes; that is, we would have to look into the difficulties created by a period of transformations. As for the political decision to maintain this friendship, however, there has been no change. I believe that the stability and solid basis of our relations have been underscored by the visit of Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev to Cuba, when a friendship and cooperation treaty between the two countries was signed. This has also been recently demonstrated at the meeting of the joint commission for economic cooperation here in Havana, which was attended by Vice President Abalkin. In addition, we have to mention that our business transactions have substantially increased this year. Even more, a joint commission, headed by Minister Kapitov for the Soviet side and Minister Ricardo Cabrisas for the Cuban side, is analyzing the conditions for continuing our relations in the next five years.

I cannot really foresee any obstacle of a political character to continuing stable and solid relations between Cuba and the Soviet Union.

[Stigneyev] Do you think there are difficulties and problems in this relation?

[Viera] Look, first we have to consider what kinds of problems you mean. If we are talking about basic problems or problems that could harm our relations from the fraternal point of view, I must say that there are no problems. On the contrary, the relation between Cuba and the USSR has lately improved on both sides. I do not think there are such obstacles.

Things change, our countries are undergoing transformations. The USSR is going through a program of reforms, while Cuba is undergoing a rectification process. The result of this transformation brings new times. There are however, some difficulties, but which are not negative. They are difficulties which are the result of a change that must improve our cooperation and recovery.

[Stigneyev] What do you think about the (?expectations)?

[Viera] Well, I think this is a relationship with great expectations, because the past 30 years have not gone by in vain. We are not talking about a friendship between two countries based on illusions. We are talking about a friendship with substance. The tens of thousands of Cubans who have travelled to the USSR, the students who graduated from the USSR, the thousands of Soviet experts who remained in Cuba, have forged our human relations. To these human relations we must add that we have learned to carry out things together.

Investments have and are being made in our economy with Soviet aid. Together we faced different labor conditions in the tropics, in the different climates of the USSR. There are relations between our commercial fleets and our fishing fleets. There are relations between our scientists. That is a basis on which we can plan a better future development. This depends a lot on the success of the Soviet reform and of the Cuban rectification process. Everyone wants the growth and strengthening of the Soviet and Cuban economies. We want stability for our two countries. We want to be able to predict periods of calmness from the point of view of politics and the unity of our peoples headed by their governments.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Ends Session, Recesses

PM1506133790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[M. Buzhkevich and G. Ovcharenko report: "Union Session. Vacations"]

[Text] The draft Law on Taxation of Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations was discussed at yesterday's morning sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

In the past it has been Article 4 on tax rates which evoked much controversy. However, by yesterday the differences between the deputies and the government had been overcome. The rate of taxation of enterprise profits has now been set at 45 percent, of which 22 percent goes into the union budget and 23 percent into union and autonomous republic and local budgets.

After many hours of debate the parliament adopted the Law on Taxation of Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations. The USSR Supreme Soviet also approved a resolution on the procedure for bringing this law into force from 1 January 1991.

The deputies then returned to the discussion of the government's proposal on the procedure for the introduction of the new retail prices of bread and bakery products which had to be postponed the previous day because the problem had not been sufficiently elaborated. Deputies decided that the USSR Council of Ministers must coordinate this proposal with the union republic supreme soviets and submit it for examination at the fourth session of the country's Supreme Soviet. Consequently, bread and bakery product prices remain unchanged.

Then the deputies passed on to the discussion of questions which feature under the heading "Miscellaneous."

The session complied with a request from B. Yeltsin to relieve him of the post of chairman of the Construction and Architecture Committee. People's Deputy Yu. Komarov has been elected its new chairman.

V. Lapygin has been relieved of the post of chairman of the Defense and State Security Committee, also at his own request. Deputy L. Sharin has been entrusted with this post.

The session adopted a USSR Supreme Soviet resolution on changes in the composition of committees and commissions.

The deputies heard and acknowledged the reports of four of their colleagues. Deputy A. Tsarevskiy read out an appeal from the First Miners Congress to the USSR Supreme Soviet in which congress delegates call on the deputies to reject the union government program and to form a new government.

Deputy S. Akhromeyev reported on the deepening crisis in the country's Armed Forces in connection with the efforts of certain circles, including the magazine OGONEK, to compromise the Army and its officer and command staff. The speaker proposed that the question of the role and place of the Armed Forces in current conditions be discussed at the fourth session.

On behalf of the officer deputy group V. Lopatin spoke about the need for profound military reform.

The session adopted an appeal from the USSR Supreme Soviet to union and autonomous republic supreme organs of state power, which was read out by People's Deputy Oleynik. The appeal speaks of the need for a consolidation of forces.

Subsequently A. Lukyanov delivered a short closing speech summing up the results of the third session.

The deputies' summer vacations have begun. The parliament will meet for its next session 3 September.

Lukyanov Chairs Supreme Soviet Presidium Session

LD1506204790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The results of the past session of the USSR Supreme Soviet were summed up at today's sitting of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which took place under the chairmanship of Comrade Lukyanov. The Presidium approved the proposal on the dates for convocating the fourth session of the Supreme Soviet and also a tentative list of draftlaws to be prepared by the coming session.

The question of the implementation of USSR Supreme Soviet's instructions regarding the development of legislation on the switch to a market economy was discussed. A commission was formed to prepare drafts for a new basis of civil legislation for the USSR and the union republics.

Results of Supreme Soviet Session Examined

LD1506163790 Moscow TASS in English 1543 GMT 15 Jun 90

["Third Session of Supreme Soviet—Results and Conclusions"; by TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenko]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—The Soviet parliament, elected a year ago, ended on Thursday its third session, which lasted four months. In the course of the session parliament adopted 30 laws—three times as many as during each of the previous sessions.

This certainly looks encouraging, however, Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, said, closing the session, that the monitoring of the observance of adopted resolutions is a weak point. Many deputies believe that the slow implementation of fundamentals of the law on the lease-holding system, adopted late last year, are a typical example of this.

In turn, parliament is growing increasingly wary of the government's proposals. A plan to transfer to a regulated market economy, put forward by Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov on May 24, was strongly criticized by legislators. Many stated that the plan actually boiled down to the growth of prices of consumer goods and did not envisage any concrete mechanism of transfer to a market system.

The discussion determined the decision taken by parliament on June 13: The deputies, far from approving the government's plan, refused to take it into account. The Supreme Soviet confined itself to asking the government to work out another plan before the beginning of the autumn session.

Deputy Prime Minister Leonid Abalkin put this down to populist feelings of many deputies and by their unwillingness to take unpopular, but necessary, decisions. There is obviously some truth in this. However, another thing is also clear: After the dramatic deterioration of the economic situation in the first quarter of this year, the government's credit of confidence has been reduced to a minimum, and the deputies' attitude to government initiatives reflects these feelings.

During the discussion of the government's latest plan, many deputies suggested a vote of confidence. They maintain that the government has failed to fulfil the first programme, adopted by the Second Congress of People's Deputies last December, and should not draw up a new one. If the proposal was not supported, this shows not the strength of the cabinet, but the weakness of the opposition. Anyway, many moderate deputies, to say nothing of radically-minded ones, stated that unless the government revised dramatically its plan for a transfer to a market system by the autumn session, it would have to resign.

It is difficult to say whether the government will adjust itself to the requirements of the present situation. However, one thing is clear: Without the consolidation of all forces of society, without cooperation between legislative and executive authorities, the country faces hard times.

Lukyanov Speaks at News Conference 15 Jun

LD1506195590 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1545 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Remarks by Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at a news conference in Moscow on 15 June, Lukyanov describes the results of the Third USSR Supreme Soviet session and responds to correspondents' questions—recorded]

[Text] [Lukyanov] What has this first year's operation of our country's highest authoritative body demonstrated? Firstly, it has confirmed, from my point of view, the correctness of the project of restructuring the country's highest bodies of state power.

Secondly, it has confirmed that the Congresses of People's Deputies and sessions of the Supreme Soviets are becoming a real instrument of sovereignty of the people [narodovlastiye], which is capable, on a democratic basis, of resolving the most acute and most important issues of the country's life under the conditions of perestroyka.

Thirdly, it has confirmed that the Supreme Soviet, set up more on the wave of democratic renewal than the USSR Congress of People's Deputies, can work as a permanently operating legislative and control body [kontrolnyy organ], and that it is gradually revealing its creative potential. Of course, with difficulties and unevenly—but it is revealing it.

The period which has elapsed has confirmed the irreversibility of the initiated process of the birth of new methods of implementing supreme state power, new approaches to the content and forms of deputies' work, relations with the electorate, and so forth.

Finally, this year saw the existence of supreme power in the form of the Congress of People's Deputies—three congresses and three sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet have taken place. It quite clearly does not constitute a rubber-stamping body, but a working body, capable of dealing with any complex issues of the country's life.

Yes, there are still many unfinished matters in this work. Many difficulties, many shortcomings. I would, employing the poet's words, say that there is still much running round in circles. This also happens. But, on the whole, it is clear that almost every day people have been gathering in this hall committed to the affairs of the country and conscious of, realizing, their responsibility for these affairs.

A very large number of issues has been within the field of view of the Supreme Soviet. From June 1989 to June 1990, at the plenary sittings of the Supreme Soviet, over 100 various issues of state life were examined, concerning the interests of practically all strata of our country's population.

It is natural that the key issue here was that of legislation. A total of 60 new USSR laws were adopted this year. I can say that not every parliament knows what is it like to be able to resolve 60 major issues in the course of a year.

If we were to attempt to classify these laws, they would have to be divided into several large groups—several, sort of, large blocks. The first block comprises legislative acts for renewing our political system. In the field of state construction; including the establishment of the post of president; including the regulations of the new Supreme Soviet; including the law on the status of all people's deputies and the law on the status of USSR People's

Deputies. This also includes the important acts on constitutional supervision—and we must continue this work—the major acts on the status and correlation of actions of the USSR and the union republics, and this includes the work which is gradually developing on preparing a new draft USSR Constitution.

The second block embraces the complex share of the economy. In fact, to be frank, of course, the main issues had to do with the legislative regulation of economic activity—the economic life of the country. By that I mean the Fundamentals of the USSR and Union Republican legislation on land, the Law on Ownership, the fundamentals of the Legislation on Leasing; the Law on the General Principles of Local Self-Government and the Local Economy; the Law on Enterprises; on Amendments to the Law on the cooperative System—a law of exceptional importance; the Law on Taxation of Enterprises, Associations, and Organizations which was, as you know, passed yesterday.

This...all these laws are a sort of precursor for the a new economic model. Unquestionably, there are elements in these laws that will be clarified and amended, but beyond doubt they have a role to play as a basis. They are already starting to play it. Gradually, not all of a sudden...but they are starting to play it.

The third group of issues are those that have to do with social policy. Satisfying the social requirements of the populace, and improving the life, work, and day to day existence of Soviet people. I must say that here, too, in spite of all the difficulties, quite a bit has been done. In particular, laws that have been passed include a law on immediate steps to improve pension support and social services for the population; pension provision for USSR citizens; the provision of pensions for servicemen; amendments and addenda to certain acts that deal with issues relating to women, the family, and childhood. The program...state program...of state policy in the sphere of the life of young peole has passed its first reading.

Furthermore, a law on preventing AIDS has been passed, as has a law on the taxation of citizens' incomes, on the gradual abolition of the bachelor tax, and so on. This group of laws thus likewise affects virtually all spheres, all realms of the life of the population and, above all, deals with satisfying the requirements of the less well-off.

As far as the direct transition to a regulated market economy is concerned, following Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov's report to the session to the Supreme Soviet and following the quite hard-hitting discussions—which all of you had the opportunity to watch—it has become clear that the new models cannot be created just like that, with one fell swoop. We need time. We need to take account of many, many fators. We need to weigh all the details and think them through. That is why now, at this preparatory stage, the most important role is already being ascribed to the creation of the legal basis for this movement forward—to the creation of new laws. The government must introduce a significant number of these laws into the Supreme Soviet.

[Correspondent Stepanyuk] Stepanyuk, from the Vremya program. Anatoliy Ivanovich, which of the bills do you consider of greatest important in the package of bills being prepared for the next, autumn, session? As I understand it, there is already such a package.

[Lukyanov] I must tell you that a meeting of the Presidium will be starting sometime around five. There we will be putting to the Presidium for its consideration a package of bills for the next session—a package that has been very thoroughly worked out in the standing commissions. There are even plans for subsequent sessions. In all, our portfolio of legislation, so to speak, contains 108 acts of various sorts. Only about 30 of these can be dealt with at a session.

And so, the most important laws at the next session will undoubtedly be a draft Union Treaty—we will have to work on that—also very important laws such as freedom of economic activity and the development of business enterprise; a collection of civil laws; on the basics of anti-monopoly legislation; on foreign investment on the territory of the USSR; on employment of the population; on banks and banking; on the customs system; on small enterprises; on joint enterprises; on joint stock and other economic societies, securities and a stock exchange; and so forth. As I have already said, a number of laws—seven major laws—have already passed their first readings. These will also have to be examined.

One particular feature is that we intend to examine several issues as a monitoring exercise. In particular, the implementation by the ministries and official departments of the basics of legislation on leasing—that's what I was talking to you about; implementation of the requirements of the law on the general principles of self-government—we'll see how things are being tackled there; implementation of the Supreme Soviet's decisions on the Aral Sea question; and a number of others.

[Unidentified correspondent] Esteemed Anatoliy Ivanovich, for a year we have been observing and writing about the difficulty with which laws and other bills come into being when connected with the Federation and the Community of Republics. We know how such confusion and conflict there is on these grounds at the moment, huge complications of some kind.

Then, when parliament appeared to be moving towards interesting and serious decisions and the Council of the Federation begins to approach matters of the relations between the republics in a new union in a new way that is somewhat paradoxical, unfamiliar perhaps, from the standpoint of yesterday, there is the statement of People's Deputy Ligachev at the peasants' congress to the effect that the Union is being torn asunder and that the policies of the country's leadership is full of compromises and that he will fight this to the last and with his last strength. I'm quoting him approximately.

These documents are actually carried side by side in our paper. [yes heard in the background] Does it not seem to you that this could have an effect on the congress' attitude towards Parliament and does it not cast doubt upon the very authority of the Parliament, which is being won with such difficulty? And, if possible, what is your own attitude to this statement? Thank you.

[Lukyanov] There is pluralism of views, and in the Politburo as well. My attitude to it is that it is an ordinary statement. I don't think the Federation is struggling. It is going through very great difficulties but this is the process of renewing the Federation. Let them show me an easy birth. There's no such thing. Let them show me the birth of a qualitatively new system without difficulties or clashes. It doesn't happen. Let them show me the human head that takes on board new ideas without a fuss. That's how I can answer you. I think—my hair is already grey and I've been dealing with this Federation for a long time now—I think that we'll be able to overcome this sickness and overcome it by means of political dialogue and where necessary, by compromise. You can't solve everything by [word indistinct].

Lukyanov Describes Conclusions of Session

LD1506171490 Moscow TASS in English 1646 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, told journalists here today about the results of the third session of Soviet parliament that ended on Thursday and plans for the next autumn session.

According to Lukyanov, 33 laws were adopted at the session which lasted four months. They deal with all spheres of the life of society—state structure, economy, social policy, rights and freedoms, inter-ethnic relations and the consolidation of law and order. The session was interrupted by an extraordinary congress of USSR people's deputies held in March, which elected Mikhail Gorbachev president of the USSR.

Lukyanov said that ten major international agreements concluded by the USSR had been ratified by the third session. Interparliamentary contacts were developing: 50 delegations of the Supreme Soviet travelled abroad this year, and 25 foreign parliamentary delegations visited the USSR.

He described insufficient control over the fulfilment of resolutions, adopted by parliament, as a defect of its work. This is why it is planned to include in the agenda of the fourth session, which opens on September 3, a government report about the implementation by ministries and other institutions of fundamentals of the union and republican legislation on leaseholding and the law on local self-government, adopted by Parliament last December.

The working schedule of the autumn session will be as strenuous as that of the recent one. Parliament intends to examine 30 bills. The bills consolidating legal foundations of a market economy, which are being worked out by the government, will be the most important. These include bills on freedom of economic activities and the development of enterprise, on banks, employment, securities and the stock exchange, on foreign investments and so on. The agenda also includes an item on a new union treaty.

The fourth session will also discuss a bill on leaving and entering the USSR. Asked by TASS why the bill, approved in the first reading by the second session of parliament, was not adopted by the third one, Lukyanov said that "the bill has been analysed in detail, there are practically no difficulties about it, but some calculations remain to be done". He expressed hope that the bill would be among the first to be adopted by the next session.

Gorbachev May Use Decrees To Enforce Laws

AU1506165790 Paris AFP in English 1557 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 15 (AFP)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev might use decrees to ensure application of laws approved by the Supreme Soviet (parliament), the president of the Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov said Friday. The Supreme Soviet had enacted many laws but the main problem was to ensure that they were enforced, he said.

Speaking at the end of the spring session, he said that "of the package of 60 laws adopted since the election of the parliament in June 1989, 33 were adopted during the third session of four months which has just ended." He told a press conference that "the main weakness is now the putting into effect of these decisions, which raises the problem of control at the planning level and of the budget which have not always yielded results."

At the next session, due to be held on September 3, "we shall study the problem of the application of laws."

Mr. Lukyanov said: "Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev might pass decrees to ensure that the laws of parliament are applied." This was permitted by a resolution approved on Wednesday. "One year of work has proved that the Supreme Soviet is not a rubber stamp but that it carries out concrete legislative work," he said.

Rejecting criticism of a decision to delay radical economic reforms until September, he said that "parliament has adopted the principle of the change to a regulated market economy, and has merely given a delay to the government." He said: "No deputy rejected the principle of the market economy, the problem lies only in the timetable and the concrete measures." He expressed satisfaction that despite these difficulties the members had entered into the spirit of debate. "Coming with different experiences, different horizons, this good-quality collection of people succeeded in tackling the most complex problems."

Mr. Lukyanov was questioned about a decision by parliament to delay until September a vote on a law on emigration and immigration. The U.S. Congress is waiting for this to be approved before it removes some trade restrictions. He replied that the Soviet Union did not link its decisions to demands from abroad. "The law is ready but quite simply parliament did not have time to examine it. I think that it will be one of the first laws to be discussed when we return," he said.

Silayev Interviewed on Election, Program

LD1506201390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: interview with Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, newly elected chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, by correspondent Minayev; in the Kremlin foyer on 15 June—live or recorded]

[Text] [Minayev] Ivan Stepanovich Silayev has been appointed chairman of the Russian Council of Ministers. First of all, I heartily congratulate you on your appointment to this high post. How do you view the new Russian Government?

[Silayev] Well, I thank you for your congratulations. This will be a very serious stage in my life when it is necessary to draw a line under past principles, methods, and view, and to devote myself completely to work on my native Russia.

The aims and the tasks have been denied. For them to be successfully implemented it is necessary to choose good executors who would be appropriate for these tasks and able to cope with them. For this reason, this will be a strongly reinforced team, a team of professionals in their fields, and I think that this team will not be old.

[Minayev] Today you made a speech and spoke about your program. Well then, what in your opinion are the most important and essential elements in it?

[Silayev] The disassembling of the previous administrative system and an energetic switch to new economic principles. Uniting and accumulating all the best of both my views and my proposals and the program Bocharov put forward—and I know that it is a program of a large collective of professionals, Bocharov's program, just as I worked with science and with scholars—it will allow us to form a program that can be realistically implemented and will give, as I consider, results undoubtedly within 500 days. [video shows conference hall, deputies, including shot of Yeltsin; deputies shown voting; Yeltsin shown speaking; Silayev shown being interviewed]

Appeals to Republican Counterparts Viewed

LD1506222890 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet has adopted an appeal to the supreme bodies of state power of union and autonomous republics. Today, the appeal says, we have to get through perhaps the most dramatic moment in the history of our state, when the temptation to seek a way out of the crisis on one's own, without taking into consideration mutual interests and, consequently, those of the country as such, may become a real threat to the state's very existence. Meanwhile, the taking into consideration and balancing of these interests is the only line along which one may achieve the purposes desired for all of us.

This is why we, USSR people's deputies, who represent all the republics and all the autonomous and territorial formations of the country, are calling you to unite your efforts for constructive joint work for the benefit and for the sake of our peoples. Today it is first of all necessary to strengthen the foundation on which the building of our renewed federation—the union of sovereign socialist states—is being erected. The all-union market must become this foundation. The USSR Supreme Soviet is calling on you to coordinate efforts on the working out of legislative principles of its creation, the renewal of our federation, and the preparation of a new union agreement.

We call for the cooperation and interaction of the Supreme Soviets of all union and autonomous republics, and their committees and commissions. We are ready to draw the most prominent economists, politologists, sociologists, and jurists into this work, and to listen to, discuss, and take into consideration every opinion and every constructive idea. We are sure, the USSR Supreme Soviet appeal says, that together, supporting one another and exchanging ideas and experience, we shall successfully reach the end of the difficult path, which no one is capable of doing on his own.

'Further Work' on Price Hike Decision Called

PM1506204390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the USSR Government's Proposals to Raise Retail Prices for Bread and Bread Products" dated Moscow, Kremlin, 14 June 1990]

[Text] Having considered the USSR Government's proposals to raise retail prices for bread and bread products and to take steps to ensure the prompt and full payment of monetary compensation to the population out of state budget funds, the USSR Supreme Soviet believes that the adoption of these proposals should be subject to mandatory examination by and coordination with the supreme organs of state power in union and autonomous republics.

Mindful of this and also of the fact that the USSR Supreme Soviet banned price rises in 1990 for goods in daily demand, including bread, rolls, groats, beans, and pasta products by the USSR Law "On the USSR State Budget for 1990" of 31 October 1989 and the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution of 20 November 1989 "On Additional Steps to Stabilize the Consumer Market and Reinforce State Control Over Prices," it is resolved that the USSR Council of Ministers be instructed to further work on the question of raising prices for bread and bread products and coordinate it with the supreme soviets and councils of ministers in union and autonomous republics and that, on the basis of and with consideration for their proposals, the examination of this question be resumed at the fourth session of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Signed] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Said To Be Recovering From Cold

Lukyanov Makes Announcement

AU1506142090 Paris AFP in English 1405 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 15 (AFP)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, who has cancelled several meetings this week because of a cold he caught upon returning to the Soviet Union from the United States, should be fine by next week, a government official said here Friday.

Anatoli Lukyanov, the president of the Supreme Soviet, told a press conference that Mr. Gorbachev had caught a cold because of the change in temperatures. "The climates of the United States and the Soviet Union are not compatible," he said. Mr. Gorbachev visited the United States and Canada from May 29 to June 3 for summit meetings with U.S. President George Bush and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney.

The Soviet president's last public appearance was on Tuesday night, when he met with the leaders of the three Baltic republics.

"He telephoned this morning from his house in Moscow where he is working on a speech. Next week, everything will return to normal," said Mr. Lukyanov.

Asked what he would do if called on to temporarily replace Mr. Gorbachev, Mr. Lukyanov, who is first in line to succeed the Soviet president, responded that "In that case, I would follow the president's program from A to Z."

Mr. Gorbachev's press service confirmed on Thursday that he was "slightly unwell," after Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene said Wednesday that the Soviet president had been unable to meet with her because of illness.

'Speedy Recovery' Wished

LD1506084690 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0805 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev is suffering from an infection, according to Party for Democratic Socialism [PDS] Chairman Gregor Gysi. Gysi told the press in Moscow today [15 June] that he had telephoned the CPSU general secretary and wished him a speedy recovery. He assumes that Gorbachev will soon resume his duties. In the "short and cordial" telephone conversation, there had been discussion on certain questions, the PDS chairman said.

In view of Gorbachev's illness, CPSU Politburo member Aleksandr Yakovlev held talks with Gysi yesterday.

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress

Pugo Chairs Preparatory Meeting

LD1606153390 Moscow TASS in English 1523 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—A group for the preparation of the 28th congress of the party, finalising provision about the Central Auditing Commission of the Soviet Communist Party, had a meeting at the party's Central Committee. A number of delegates to the congress attended the meeting.

Specifical proposals and remarks were made on the draft provision about the commission. The meeting was conducted by alternate member of the Politburo, chairman of the party Control Committee at the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party, Boris Pugo.

Commission Discusses Policies

LD1506224290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1804 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—The latest session of the CPSU Central Committee Commission on Issues of International Policies has taken place. A.N. Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, chaired the session.

One of the points on the agenda was the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States from the viewpoint of the political and practical tasks facing communists, party organizations, and research establishments of the CPSU under the conditions of the development of Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the spheres of politics, economics, and culture. Ye.M. Primakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and member of the USSR Presidential Council, gave a report on this issue.

As was noted at the session, the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting confirmed that the principles of the new political thinking drawn up by the soviet leadership are being instilled in the fabric of interstate relations and are actively working in favor of restructuring in our country and the world as a whole. The major steps agreed during the course of the talks in the sphere of disarmament, the stabilization of the situation in various areas of economic cooperation, and of humanitarian links may lift mutual understanding and interaction between the USSR and the United States to a qualitatively higher level and have a favorable influence on European and world politics.

Those participating in the exchange of opinions stressed that favorable conditions are being created for the extensive inclusion of the Soviet economy in world economic links, which is especially important in connection with the economic reform in the USSR and the formation of market relations in the country. The commission expressed its conviction about the need for actively using the internal political and economic prerequisites which have taken shape, for the purposes of resolving topical and long-term problems in the development of the country's national economy and for setting up of contemporary production facilities for satisfying the demands of Soviet people for goods and services.

The commission drew attention to ways in which party organizations and individual communists could promote the development of cooperation between the two countries—including along parliamentary lines, in relations between individual states and Soviet republics, between businessmen, scientific, and cultural figures, the mass media and representatives of the various groups of society, and in all that is encompassed by the concept of people's diplomacy.

The international aspects of the changes in Central and East Europe came in for analysis at the meeting. V.M. Falin, head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, delivered a report. In the course of the ensuing discussion it was said that the events that have occurred in this region of late are a manifestation of the fundamental changes going on in the world, and are a part of the complex process of moving forward towards a qualitatively new status for mankind which goes far beyond the framework of the well-established notions and dogmas. The main trend in the changes has been the democratization of public and state life, which has resulted in a regrouping of social and political forces, the formation of new structures and the rejection by the peoples of the outdated models for the organization of society's life.

The CPSU's principled attitude toward events in the East European countries stems directly from the ideas of the new political thinking, which is firmly rooted in respect for the right of every people freely to choose the path of its development. This approach has played an important role in strengthening international confidence, and it creates a good basis, too, for further cooperation and realtions with the countries of this region as allies.

The participants in the meeting stressed that the very nature of the ties between the USSR and its neighbors in East and Central Europe is changing radically in the new conditions. Center stage is being taken by the principles of equality of rights, independence, mutual advantage, a balance of interests—all of which create the basis for a stable development of bilateral and multilateral cooperation.

The recent Moscow conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee reaffirmed that the cooperation of its participants—renewed in line with the requirements of the times—can and must play an important role in bringing about the idea of a "European home", a new, nonbloc based structure for relations in Europe, including the security sphere.

A number of specific problems relating to political, economic, and cultural interaction with all the countries of Central and East Europe were examined in the course of the discussion, as were problems pertaining to the active participation in this of the public, and of communist and other left-wing parties.

The session discussed the condition of and prospects for relations between the CPSU and social democracy and other left-wing forces at the current stage which are contributing to the progressive development of countries and peoples. Various aspects of this important trend of the CPSU's international activities, which are now gaining particular topicality, were examined.

It was noted that the leading figures of international social democracy evaluate highly the significance of perestroyka and its success for the destiny of mankind and socialism. And they express their solidarity with us from these positions. On this basis a deepening of mutual understanding and movement to a new quality of relations are possible.

The CPSU is open to cooperation with socialist and social democratic parties which it sees as natural partners in the search for answers to the challenges of our times. It is understandable that radical improvements in Europe's political life will create a more complicated arrangement of forces, and this must be taken into account. But the guiding line remains as before—the cooperation of all left-wing, democratic forces. In this connection it is important to overcome both preconceived views in relation to social democracy and also trendy anticommunist cliches, employed by some representatives of social democratic parties.

Attention was paid to the need to study the practical experience of Western social democracy, especially of ruling parties, in solving questions of economic and social policy, and ecological and other problems.

Participating in the discussion of the CPSU Central Committee's commission's agenda were: G.V. Novozhilov, general designer of the Moscow S.V. Ilyushin mechanical engineering factory; E.P. Velikhov, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; G.A. Arbatov, director of the USA and Canada Institute; R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's

Soviet of Nationalities; A.G. Kovalev, first deputy USSR foreign minister; G.I. Revenko, member of the USSR Presidential Council; V.V. Zhurkin, director of the Europe Institute; B.T. Batsanov, chief of the Secretariat of the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; V.M. Nikoforov, deputy USSR foreign minister; Ye. I. Osadchuk, deputy USSR minister of foreign economic relations; V.V. Prusov, head of a department of the USSR State Planning Committee; V.D. Demchuk, chief of the department of the state foreign economics commission of the USSR Council of Ministers; R.G. Yanovskiy, rector of the Academy of Social Sciences; Yu. A. Krasin, rector of the Institute of Social Sciences; Yu. I. Zuyev, deputy head of the CPSU Central Commitee's International Department; and A.B. Veber, a consultant of the CPSU Central Committee's International Department.

Communists Seen as Divided

LD1606101590 Moscow TASS in English 0932 GMT 16 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Prokhorov]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—As the crucial 28th party congress approaches, Soviet Communists stand divided over which course to take to strengthen the party and help take the country out of its current crisis.

The debate over the party's future was launched by the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, which published its draft platform and party rules for the congress in February.

Several groups within the party came up with their own platforms and there is a real threat of a formal split at the congress.

Some communists believe a split would be catastrophic for the party and say it should be avoided at any cost.

Meanwhile, others are certain that it will only help cleanse the ranks and consolidate the organisation.

There is much debate going on about the principle of democratic centralism, with some saying that the renunciation of the principle will bring the party on the verge of collapse, while others maintain that the tenet should be dropped if the party wants to be democratic.

There are now three major groups in the party, each having its own platform—in addition to supporters of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee platform, there are also two other trends—the Democratic platform and the Marxist platform.

However, a considerable portion of the party supports neither of these.

While the future of the party seems uncertain, its leaders are calling for consolidation, warning that confrontation will only complicate the country's mounting problems.

Girenko Views Upcoming Congresses

LD1806120690 Moscow TASS in English 1153 GMT 18 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev is unlikely to be the leader of the Russian Communist Party, secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Andrey Girenko believes.

Girenko was speaking at a press conference here today about the forthcoming CPSU congress and the Russian party conference which is to open here on Tuesday. He named several possible candidates for the post of first secretary of the Russian Communist Party—Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov, Minister for the Interior Vadim Bakatin and CPSU Central Committee Secretary Yuriy Manayenkov. He said Boris Yeltsin's name had not come up yet.

Asked how the emergence of a Russian Communist Party would affect the CPSU, Girenko said it would help Russian communists strengthen their positions and exert a positive influence on the Soviet Communist Party as a whole.

"The conference," he said, "is expected to be held in two stages. The first one, which will probably last three to four days, is expected to consider the question of turning the conference into a congress of Russian communists. It is difficult to say whether a central committee will be formed at the first stage. The second stage, which will be held after the CPSU congress, will apparently adopt a programme and rules of the Communist Party of Russia."

Girenko, who is responsible on the CPSU Central Committee for inter-ethnic relations, devoted much attention to this sphere. He believes it is now possible to formulate a new allied treaty among the republics making up the USSR.

Turning to relations among the communist parties of the constituent republics, Girenko stressed the need to preserve the party's unity throughout the country. "The congress must find a solution that would allow the CPSU to go on being a single party in our federal state and, at the same time, permit the communist parties of union republics to react adequately to changes in the sociopolitical situation in their respective republics."

CPSU Democratic Platform Conference Held

Opens 16 Jun

LD1606140790 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Today, the second all-union conference of the CPSU Democratic Platform opened in Moscow. It is considering the political situation that has arisen in the country and the CPSU. Tasks and prospects for further development of the movement are under discussion. Those gathered have posed as their main task the elaboration of a general strategy of supporters of the CPSU Democratic Platform on their taking part in the proceedings of the forthcoming 28th congress of the CPSU. The participants of the conference will discuss a package of documents concerning the platform and the statute of the movement which will be put forward at the 28th CPSU Congress.

Views Russian Party, Baltics

LD1706153690 Moscow TASS in English 1514 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—Members of the Democratic Platform faction in the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) have called for the formation of a Russian Communist Party of a parliamentary type at their conference in Moscow.

The Democratic Platform is one of three factions that have formed within the CPSU in the process of preparations for the party's 28th congress, set for July.

The conference is attended by 877 communists from 12 constituent republics and 65 regions of the country.

A resolution, adopted by the conference today, says that the Communist Party of Russia "should seek the right to political leadership exclusively in free parliamentary elections in competition with other political parties."

The resolution notes that the Russian Communist Party "should be ready to join a voluntary alliance with similar parties of constituent republics."

The conference discussed further tactics of the Democratic Platform and issues that its members plan to raise at the CPSU congress.

Some Democrats favour the preservation of unity with the CPSU, whereas others call for an immediate breakaway from it. However, the majority of Democratic Platform members hinge the resolution of this issue on the outcome of the congress.

The conference today adopted another resolution expressing support for the Baltic Republics' efforts to restore their national sovereignty and independence.

A press release, issued at the conference, says that delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress will include about 100 members of the Democratic Platform, or two percent of all congress delegates.

'Various Trends' Emerge

LD1606161190 Moscow TASS in English 1550 GMT 16 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The second all-union conference of supporters of the movement "Democratic Platform in the Soviet Communist Party" opened here today. It was organised by the Coordinating Council of the movement.

The main item on today's agenda of the conference is the problem of working out the strategy of the democratic platform and its tasks for the 28th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party. Three various trends established themselves during discussion.

"It is necessary to formulate clearly the main requirements of the Democratic Platform which we intend to advance at the congress," said Vlamidir Lysenko, member of the Coordinating Council, delegate to the 28th congress of the Soviet Communist Party. "During the congress we shall certainly be looking for compromise with supporters of other political currents in the party. Unless compromise is achieved, the Democratic Platform should declare that it withdraws from the Soviet Communist Party and exert effort to create its own democratic party of a parliamentary type," he said.

Member of the Coordinating Council Igor Chubais declared for creating already now an alternative Soviet Communist Party and for transition to a multiparty system in the Soviet Union through a division of the Communist Party. He said that in order to make radical transformations in the country's political life, the Soviet Communist Party should first of all be separated from the economy, from law-enforcement bodies. Then it will be possible to form political parties.

Vyacheslav Shestakovsky has a different opinion. He stated that representatives of various political platforms, if they work jointly, can find at the congress a way out of the situation in which the Communist Party is now. "Making common decisions, we shall undoubtedly be basing ourselves on methods of various philosophical schools and various approaches to this problem," he said.

It should be noted that some 100 supporters of the Democratic Platform, or two per cent of the total number of delegates, will attend the congress of the Soviet Communist Party. The news conference was told that, according to the latest sociological surveys, the influence of the Democratic Platform is larger than its representation at the congress.

Delegates to the conference today intend to form regional sections which will discuss possible variants of the development of the movement "Democratic Platform in the Soviet Communist Party" in union republics and various regions. Sections to deal with various topics will be formed for a more detailed discussion of the work of the Democratic Platform at local soviets of people's deputies, among youths, etc.

Urges Abandoning Communism

LD1706175990 Moscow TASS in English 1730 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Yuriy Kozmin]

[Text] Moscow June 17 TASS—Members of the Democratic Platform faction in the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) adopted a political resolution at their conference which ended in Moscow today.

The resolution contains theses that the faction plans to set forth at the 28th CPSU Congress, set for July.

The theses include a voluntary alliance of parties of constituent republics on a federative basis, the dismantling of the organisational foundations of the party of a totalitarian type and its replacement with a party of a parliamentary type.

Participants in the conference pointed to the need to "renounce communism as the CPSU's objective, changing simultaneously the party's name, and proclaim as its goal the building of a democratic society on the principles of freedom, justice and solidarity."

It was decided that, in case the Democratic Platform's proposals were rejected at the congress, the faction would form a new political party.

Democratic Platform members who would not join the new party will have the right to remain in the CPSU.

Discussions at the conference focused on the renunciation of the monopoly of one ideology in the party and on the drive for broad pluralism of views.

The Russian Federation section of the Democratic Platform proposed a resolution on the need to form a new Russian political party of a parliamentary type.

The conference today adopted another resolution expressing support for the Baltic republics' efforts to restore their national sovereignty and independence.

The majority of Democratic Platform members hinge the platform's further actions on the outcome of the CPSU congress.

Parliament Appeals to Regions on Union, Market

PM1506153390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Unattributed account of USSR Supreme Soviet address "To the Supreme Organs of State Power in the Union and Autonomous Republics"]

[Text] Esteemed People's Deputies!

This USSR Supreme Soviet address has been dictated by the nature and features of the tasks whose resolution the country has approached and by our realization of our common responsibility to the voters, to the whole people, to their present and future.

Today we must surmount virtually the most dramatic watershed in the history of our state, when the temptation to seek a way out of the crisis on our own without considering one another's interests, and consequently those of the country as a whole, could pose a real threat to our state's very existence. However, it is only through considering and balancing these interests that we can achieve the goals we all long for. We cannot otherwise prevent the destruction of the economic, social, and legal structure of Soviet society and its statehood.

We can achieve success only together, only through close cooperation. Progress in our multiethnic country is indivisible. This does not, of course, mean that everyone must keep in step and only move at one command, nor does it violate in any way the sovereignty of the soviet socialist republics.

That is why we USSR people's deputies, who represent all the republics, all the country's autonomous and territorial formations, urge you to pool your efforts for constructive joint work for the good and for the sake of our peoples.

Today it is above all necessary to consolidate the foundation on which the edifice of our renewed federation—a union of sovereign socialist states—is erected. This foundation should be the all-union market, which can only be created by joint efforts with free movement of goods and ideas, and with a well-organized mechanism of union reserve systems—resource, financial, and labor—which securely protect the interests of every Soviet republic.

The formation of an all-union market that reflects and develops the integration of the country's economy will give fresh impetus to the elaboration of a union treaty in line with the realities of the contemporary phase of interethnic relations and the consolidation of the treaty foundations of the USSR. We already have a sufficiently stable legal base for this, which is developing from the laws recently adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, although here too both new approaches and new options for decisions may be and will indisputably be found in joint quest by all the subjects of the Soviet Federation.

The USSR Supreme Soviet urges coordinated efforts to elaborate the legislative principles for the creation of an all-union market, the renewal of our federation, and the preparation of a new union treaty. All the lawmaking experience accumulated by union organs, by our committees and commissions, and by USSR people's deputies can be used to this end.

We urge the supreme soviets in all the union and autonomous republics and their committees and commissions to cooperate, and we are ready to enlist prominent economists, political specialists, sociologists, and lawyers in this work and to hear out, discuss, and take into consideration every opinion and every constructive idea.

Let us show a general desire for cooperation in which no one can lose, be hurt, or offended.

We make this appeal to you and through you—to everyone who cherishes the interests of our fatherland. We are convinced that together, supporting one another, and exchanging ideas and experience, we can successfully cover the difficult path that none can overcome on their own.

[Signed] The USSR Supreme Soviet

Adopted at the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 14 June 1990.

'Consultations' To Precede Action on Prices

PM1506154190 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 16 Jun 90 p 1

[M. Dymkovets report: "At the 28th Party Congress Press Center"]

[Text] How does the government react to reports that the miners' congress in Donetsk has expressed no confidence in it? This question, in particular, was put to Yu.D. Maslyukov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Commission], at yesterday's meeting with journalists at the press center.

"A central newspaper has indeed mentioned this," he replied. "However, we have not yet seen the official resolution adopted by the miners' congress. But I think that this is a very serious signal per se. And we will draw the necessary conclusions from it. I believe that the main thing is for them to realize the following: The government program for the transition to the market aims not to violate anyone's interests, including the miners', but to formulate a correct policy for extricating the country from the difficult position in which it has found itself."

The conditions for the implementation of this policy were the main topic of the press conference. Yu. Maslyukov stressed over and over that no steps will be taken without consultations with the people. What form will these consultations take? It seems that a poll [opros] of public opinion is to begin in the near future and we will all have to answer two fundamental questions: Which reform scenario do we prefer—immediate transition to market prices, or a transition with prices subject to initial regulation. The second question is as follows: What kind of compensation do we prefer?

Gorbachev Aide Maslennikov Interviewed

PM1706192190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with A.A. Maslennikov, head of the USSR president's press service, by Lieutenant Colonel V. Kosarev under the rubric "Portrait in the Light of Glasnost"; date and place not specified: "On the President's Team"—first paragraph is an introduction]

[Text] We have already reported the creation of the USSR President's Press Service headed by A.A. Maslennikov. We now offer readers a conversation between him and and our parliamentary correspondent.

[Kosarev] Arkadiy Afrikanovich, the USSR president's press service and the post of press secretary are recent innovations in our country. Why were they set up?

[Maslennikov] I think that this is part of the process of democratization and glasnost. Today we are moving away from the old stereotypes and secrecy in the work of state organs, the entire apparatus of supreme power, and the state and political leadership. And second, the public really must have broad knowledge of the actual activity of the president as head of state so that there should be no suspicions or reservations. In our conditions this is particularly important, given our tragic past. The president is the head of a democratic state and everything relating to presidential power must be democratic. Thus it was deemed necessary to create a system which makes it possible to provide extensive coverage of his activity and the work of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation. That was the purpose of creating the press service.

But in my view we still have not achieved the optimum desired results. Tradition is still proving stronger than we are. I think that our reports on sittings of the Presidential Council and the Council of the Federation should be more extensive and, most important, be widely commented on.

Journalists' wish that the head of state himself should appear before them more often is quite legitimate and correct. I am conveying that wish to the President. But it must be understood how busy M.S. Gorbachev is now. I don't think that I am revealing a very great secret when I tell you that, as the 28th party congress gets nearer, Mikhail Sergeyevich, as General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is paying particularly great attention to questions of the democratic renewal of the party, the preparation for the congress, and other important problems of party life.

[Kosarev] At press conferences and briefings, journalists have several times asked the president to give a sort of account of his first 100 days in office...

[Maslennikov] I have already said that commemorating a president's first 100 days is a purely American tradition. I think that in our country the criteria for evaluating the president's activity should be how the entire system of state power and its various elements—legislative, executive, and judicial—work, as well as what the government is doing and how it is doing it.

[Question] Why did the president choose you when appointing a press secretary? Tell us a little about yourself.

[Maslennikov] I am not the one to answer the question of why the choice fell on me. As for my qualification for the job, clearly, the fact that I, on the one hand, have quite thorough professional training as a journalist, including in international affairs journalism, was taken into account. I worked for PRAVDA for 24 years, I was permanent correspondent in India, Pakistan, and Britain—in all I spent around 17 years on permanent assignment abroad. I have a good knowledge of the world of the press and the mentality of journalists. And on the other hand, clearly, note was taken of the fact that I am an economist by training—I am a candidate of economic sciences. For 10 years I worked at the Institute of World Economics. This also helps me get to grips with those complex problems which are most urgent today. Well, what else? Perhaps my knowledge of foreign languages helped to some extent—I speak English quite fluently and I know Hindi and Urdu.

[Kosarev] How specifically are your functions defined? You aren't just the president's mouthpiece, are you?

[Maslennikov] I am the president's press secretary. This implies that my main duties are meeting Soviet and foreign journalists who are interested in our head of state's activity, issuing press releases on the results of various measures in which he is involved, and organizing meetings between the president and representatives of the press. I have taken part in M.S. Gorbachev's press conferences with the U.S. and French presidents and the British prime minister... I have to maintain contacts with many organizations because the most varied questions crop up.

[Kosarev] Arkadiy Afrikanovich, how often do you meet with the president? Does he give you instructions or do you decide independently what to do in given circumstances?

[Maslennikov] I cannot work independently, because the point and content of my work is to provide coverage of the president's activity. It is too soon to talk about established or regular, scheduled meetings. It varies. For instance, during the visit to the United States or the president's trip to the Urals I was with him the whole working day, which lasted 18 hours at least. It is the same here. Sometimes I see the president three or four times a day. But sometimes there are days when I do not meet with him at all—if he is busy on some matter or carrying out measures which the press secretary is not required to take part in. As far as I am aware the procedure is similar for the press secretaries of the U.S. and French presidents.

[Kosarev] What is the hardest part of your work?

[Maslennikov] The hardest part is knowing at any given moment how and what the president thinks on various questions. That is a permanent problem. It has always existed, still does, and will continue to do so because the president is head of state. I have to be au fait with what the president is doing and what his opinion is on this or that question. I must find channels, ways, and means to be adequately informed. This, clearly, is the main problem. Of course, there are situations when I try to make direct contact so as to clarify the president's position on the most important problems.

[Kosarev] During your joint work with the president what new things have you discovered in him and his character?

[Maslennikov] I have not just seen for myself once more that he is an extraordinarily able man and, as they say, a born politician. Although politicians are not born. He has those innate character traits which help him very much as a politician. Mikhail Sergeyevich is extremely receptive to people's ideas. He has a surprising ability, which struck me in Britain when I was correspondent there and M.S. Gorbachev arrived as head of a Supreme Soviet delegation—the ability to immediately join in a conversation with an interlocutor and grasp his idea. This also impressed the British. I interpreted at his conversations with various important politicians, and especially with British trade union leaders and bankers—they told me then that Mikhail Sergeyevich was so deeply informed about their problems as though he were a trade unionist or banker by profession. He has a vast experience of life and a broad education—legal, economic, and agrarian. And that influences his ability to get to the heart of problems.

The second point is his ability to talk with people—not only in the sense of grasping what they are saying but also to get his ideas across to them. That is what we call, perhaps somewhat simplistically, communicability.

[Kosarev] You immediately see that for yourself, even when interviewing the president.

[Maslennikov] That is absolutely right. Mikhail Sergeyevich has a very fine appreciation of people's moods, he quickly finds the right words and the right tone to convey his meaning. The latest example, and a very typical one in this respect, was provided by the trip to the United States. He used completely different words, forms of address, even the tone of his speech was different when, for example, Mikhail Sergeyevich talked with professors in a university auditorium where his interlocutors included five Nobel prize winners. During that conversation our president impressed his audience by the way in which he is equally well versed in the basic problems of political economy and, for example, seismology. Specialists in genetic engineering spoke during that meeting, and with each one he found the ability to speak his own language, as it were, and demonstrated a broad knowledge in those spheres. This was a very specific, business-like, and professional conversation. And literally five minutes later he gave an address to students. This was a completely different speech—not only in content but also in the form of delivery. It really was a speech to students, designed to appeal to people's consciousness and intellect.

[Kosarev] Was this meeting with students a protocol function and did M.S. Gorbachev prepare his speech in advance?

[Maslennikov] You will appreciate that a presidential speech is no joke and, as a rule, he prepares in advance. But as far as I have been able to tell in the comparatively brief period that I have been his press secretary, he never reads from other people's prepared texts. In the first place, Mikhail Sergeyevich always dictates what he is going to say. Of course, his assistants prepare materials for his speeches. But then he does a lot of work on them himself. He has a well developed sense of associative thinking. He often brings into a speech examples from related areas and from his personal experience. His speech is usually not that of an orator who isn't listening to anyone and is only thinking about what he should say. He grasps a mood with great sensitivity and his speeches always have an element of conversation about them.

Our president has a colossal capacity for work. His working day always begins very, very early and never ends before 2200 hours. During trips he even goes on beyond midnight. On his extraordinarily packed agenda paramount place is now taken by such questions as the economic reform, housing and other social problems, questions of building the federation, and the elaboration of a new union treaty. The concept put forward by the president for the creation of a union of sovereign socialist states is of fundamental significance for the future of our multinational community. This concept is the only platform on which cooperation among the different political forces and representatives of different republics is possible.

I would also note that, on all major political questions, Mikhail Sergeyevich always sees the main issue, the essence of the problem, and thinks about ways to resolve that problem, not about his image, which, unfortunately, is often the hallmark of professional politicians.

It is these features which mark M.S. Gorbachev out as an individual and as a politician. Yes, he is an outstanding individual and a great politician. And working with him is extraordinarily interesting, even if not easy.

[Kosarev] One final question for you, Arkadiy Afrikanovich. What would the ideal USSR President's Press Service be like, in your view?

[Maslennikov] The ideal USSR President's Press Service, in my view, would be always attuned, like the most sensitive tuning fork, to what the head of state is doing and would be immersed in everything of public interest. One which could always convey the president's thoughts and deeds to the public as quickly as possible. One which could inform the president himself of what is going on in the mass media and thus help both him and you—the journalists—to write comprehensive and interesting pieces about the president's activity and presidential power.

Lukyanov Interviewed on Supreme Soviet Work

LD1606224790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1745 GMT 16 Jun 90

["Topical Interview" program" Interview with Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov by political observer V. Lyubovtsev; date, place not given—recorded]

[Text] [Lyubovtsev] Anatoliy Ivanovich, the Third Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which was the most protracted in our entire history, has come to an end. It lasted almost four months, and a total of almost 400 hours were spent in sittings, whether of the seperate chambers or jointly. However, this is just statistics, so to speak, and figures. Do you have a sense of inner satisfaction at the results of the session?

[Lukyanov] I think that, all in all, the parliament has done a great deal, although I would like to have done more and to have done it better. Most importantly, I would like the decisions of the parliament to be put into effect and to operate. We still have not really achieved that, but overall the Supreme Soviet undoubtedly has done some very solid, very thorough work. After all, it is interesting that in June we are marking the anniversary of a year's work of the Supreme Soviet, which was elected on 4 June of last year, and we have calculated that during that time the Supreme Soviet has considered more than 370 different issues. Of these, 60 were major laws.

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] Which were adopted?

[Lukyanov] Which were adopted—and many other issues. The Supreme Soviet responded to the life of the country. It was a very wide range of issues that covered literally all areas of the life of society, all the nationalities and nations. All in all, it was a very wide range of issues. It does seem to me, however, that when people talk about the Supreme Soviet, they talk primarily about that part of the iceberg of the work of the Supreme Soviet that was done at the session and is above water. Everyone, the whole country, saw it.

[Lyubovtsev] The work that was seen on the television screen?

[Lukyanov] That is right. Then it was not simply 400 hours, but 400 hours on the air, so every twitch in a muscle could been seen, but the underwater part, the bulk of the iceberg, was made up of the work of the standing commissions and committees of people's deputies. For the year, this amounts to more than 600 sittings of the committees and commissions which examined a mass of issues, drafted laws, heard ministers and experts, worked on each wording. This work somehow remained behind the scenes, but it is a vital part of the life of the Supreme Soviet. One would like it to be shown even more because it is very important, and all the more so when more than 1,000 people's deputies took part in the work of the standing comissions and committees.

[Lyubovtsev] Who were not members of the Supreme Soviet?

[Lukyanov] Who were not members of the Supreme Soviet. At the sittings, too, always about one-third of our speakers USSR people's deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet, and we are simply delighted by this.

What else featured at this session? We had a large section of work in chambers. One-quarter of all sittings were held by the seperate chambers, and 19 laws were adopted at seperate sittings of the chambers. True, on occasion conciliating commissions did have to be set up, but these also found the necessary solutions. Then, it has already been established that bills are adopted at the Supreme Soviet in two readings, two rounds. This also is very important. Finally, a whole lot of parliamentary amendments emerged when deputies put forward their amendments. I am always pleased to stress that when such an amendment is adopted, it is the (Peryazev) amendment, the Yudin amendment, or the Sazonov amendment, etc, being adopted.

[Lyubovtsev] So, for the first time authorship has appeared?

[Lukyanov] That is right. For the first time, authorship has appeared. There even has been one draft law that was submitted by one deputy alone, and it was adopted. That was the draft law submitted by People's Deputy Aleksandr Maksimovich Yakovlev, a professor and lawyer, and that draft law was adopted. So overall, the Supreme Soviet has been renewed. Its work has begun to sound different. Many interesting people have emerged. I know them all now, their names and surnames, and I think that being the chairman now does not consist of running the Supreme Soviet, but of working together. That, perhaps, is the most intersting thing. Together we look for the wording, for approaches to an issue; together we are pleased or distressed, and then we have a single collective, with its own persona. I would not say of people who think in the same way—they don't—but of people capable of solving the most complicated problems.

[Lyubovtsev] From what you have said, Anatoliy Ivanovich, it follows that when a rotation is carried out, a new Supreme Soviet elected, the membership renewed, you will have to start over again to make contacts and establish mutual understanding with its members.

[Lukyanov] I do not think that will be the case. The point is, to start with, that only a fifth is renewed, and these people will fairly pour into the Supreme Soviet. However, the point is that undoubtedly, I am convinced of it, the deputies will elect precisely those USSR people's deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet who have done active work at the Supreme Soviet.

[Lybuvotsev] Who have already proved themselves?

[Lukyanov] Who have already proved themselves. This makes sense because some of the deputies, admittedly a small number, already are saying that they would like to move out of the Supreme Soviet, back to being simply people's deputies, and to remain in their constituencies, working and meeting at congresses. On the other hand, there is another section that is an influx of new forces, as it were. Whatever the case, it is a healthy and a necessary process. Evidently, we will examine and deal with this issue at the forthcoming Congress of People's Deputies, which evidently is to be held in the fall.

[Lyubovtsev] Anatoliy Ivanovich, coming back, all the same, to the session that ended the day before yesterday, which of the laws adopted there do you see as most important for the state in which our society finds itself at present?

[Lukyanov] I think one could cite several groups of such laws. These are, above all, the laws connected with political reform and the introduction of a democratic presidency in our country. There is a group of laws here; we have adopted new standing orders for the Supreme Soviet and a law on the status of the people's deputies, etc.

At the same time, the largest group of laws is made up of economic laws, in the area of economy, the carrying out of reform, the switch to a market economy. These make up the lion's share of all the laws. What are they? This session has done a great deal in that direction. The law on property, the law on land, the law on lease-holding, the law on local self-government and the local economy, on economic relations between the union and autonomous republics and the USSR as a whole. There is the system of tax laws and the introduction of a tax inspectorate. Even the last law, on the taxation of enterprises, was discussed four times at the session, and I would say that every letter of it was approached very intently and committedly, and it was adopted at the final sitting of the session. These laws made up the essence of the economic section, so to speak, of the draft laws, of legislative activity.

Then there was a large group of social laws that covered problems connected with the individual. Here I would note, above all, the law on pensions. It is interesting that we received half a million proposals from citizens, half a million.

[Lyubovtsev] On that draft law?

[Lukyanov] On that draft law. One thousand, eight hundred and fifty deputies submitted their proposals on this draft law. In effect, not a single article was not subject to amendment during the process of adopting this law. The discussion itself went on for a fairly long time in the Supreme Soviet, and finally we adopted this law. The law on servicemen's pensions, the program of aid for women, children, and large families, etc. The state program on youth policies, which was adopted on the first reading.

In other words, whatever question was examined, each time it had to do with the person. That is another aspect. It is natural that the tension in relations between the nationalities obliged us to adopt a whole package of bills on interethnic matters, seven major laws. These are laws on relations between the USSR and the subjects of the federation, the law on the procedure for seceding from the USSR, the law on the languages of the people's of the USSR, and so on, a whole series of laws. I think that these laws will become...

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] Of a new union treaty?

[Lukyanov] Of a new union treaty. Of course, something new will be introduced and there will be new approaches of some kind, but in theory this is a good basis for working on a new union treaty. In addition, a number of laws on legal reform have been adopted, including the law linked to the introduction of trial by jury in our country, and a fairly large number of international bills. We heard the minister of foreign affairs. We heard Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's report on his return from the United States and Canada. And we have, at this session alone, ratified eight major international agreements and conventions, so that the volume of work has been extremely great, and among it were many weighty and serious bills that will work to the benefit of perestroyka. They will do this, but should work better.

[Lyubovtsev] All this is indeed so, Anatoliy Ivanovich, yet our country, as we all know, is still in a state of profound crisis—economic, political-social, and spiritual crisis—and many people think that our country's leadership is being too slow to take the necessary measures. This sort of criticism also is being directed at the Supreme Soviet—as you, of course, are aware—to the effect that the legislators sit there working, discussing, and adopting laws, good laws, yet these laws just do not work. Life, real life, is becoming no better, and it is sometimes thought that the opposite is the case. What would your reply be to such criticisms?

[Lukyanov] These criticisms are justified, in the main. The country is at a turning point, and we concluded this session with the adoption of an appeal to the Supreme Soviets of the other republics, both autonomous and union republics. Here we stated directly that today we have to surmount perhaps the most dramatic barrier in the history of our state, when the temptation to seek a way out of the crisis individually, without taking into account the country's interests, may become a real threat to the state's very existence. That is, we have made a sober evaluation of the state of affairs.

What does this involve? Well, first of all, this means that it is not just laws that are needed to improve this situation in the country. What is needed is a collective search, and the collective labour and collective work of millions of people. This has all gotten messed up in the country now; that is quite clear. What is needed are collective efforts on the part of all state bodies, both executive and managerial, and of legislative and law enforcement bodies, all of them. Joint efforts on the part of the republics are needed for this, too. Therefore, this process is a difficult one, but the Supreme Soviet should take a far more active part in this, too, far more active. We therefore regard it to be one of the most difficult tasks of the Supreme Soviet now, but an absolutely essential one, to strengthen to the maximum the control functions of the supreme body of power because this control frequently is overlooked in the flood of legislative acts.

[Lyubovtsev] How are these control functions implemented?

[Lukyanov] How are they implemented? Well, indeed, more issues started to be examined at the session by way of control: The government started to give reports, and the first attempt—perhaps not wholly successful—at the government replying to questions from deputies has been made. Incisive, keen questions were asked during examination of the ecological program, for example, and on Chernobyl. The government's latest proposals have come in for a very critical view, too. So the control functions are growing, but nevertheless, this is not all that needs to be done. We will do everything possible to insure that these are the control functions of the parliament as a whole, and of committees and commissions. Without this, we cannot move forward.

Correspondingly, the work of the executive organs at the grassroots, at the local soviets must be established very thorougly indeed. The Supreme Soviet must help organize this work here, too. Without this, we cannot advance or organize unified progress.

As far as disputes at the session are concerned, I recall each time what Heredotus said: Unless opposing opinions are expressed, one has nothing from which to choose the best; This is indeed the case, and so disputes are inevitable, necessary, like the emergence of alternative options. For example, on the last issue at the session we merged the basic option with the alternative option, and a pretty good decision came out of it, at that. So these disputes are necessary. A poet once said that if the regiment marches in step, the bridge falls down. No, we must not march in step here, we must compare ideas and opinions, then it is possible to work. Though on no account should we be too hasty with legislations. I think, therefore, that on the one hand the reproaches that we are lagging behind are correct, but on the other hand, one always should act cirumspectly, and particularly where legislation is concerned.

[Lyubovtsev] Now, Anatoliy Ivanovich, for this question: Following the abolition of Article Six of the Constitution on the leading role of the CPSU, the center of power in our country has shifted—perhaps it is more correct to say it is shifting—to the president of the USSR Supreme Soviet. Does this effect your work in anyway? What can you say about this?

[Lukyanov] In general, more issues have begun to be considered at the Supreme Soviet. This is noticeable.

When the article was changed, it was only changed and not revoked, Article Six. We, in the Supreme Soviet started to have more pluralism, I would say. The first representatives of, let us say, the Social Democrats appeared in the Supreme Soviet. More of a kind of group opinion emerged—let us say—ecologists, scientists, workers, and the Soyuz deputies' group. All of this has had a positive effect in so much as it is possible to consider the various laws from different positions and different points of view. On the one hand, cooperation with the president is going well. Relations in this triangle—president, government and Supreme Soviet—are taking shape gradually. They are quite active. There is a whole series of occasions when the Supreme Soviet has a critical attitude toward the government's proposals. It was like this just now at the last session, when the government's measures on carrying out further efforts and on the introduction of a regulated market economy were proposed.

[Lyubovtsev] Moreover, some of the laws proposed by the government were revised by the Supreme Soviet.

[Lukyanov] Well, you know how it is. People sometimes say here in effect, what is this? Is everything, are all of the draft laws given by the government? It is not like this. About half of our legislative acts are either very thoroughly reworked in the commissions or are submitted by them. Therefore it should not be said that only governmental draft laws are adopted, but on the other hand, another feature in our activities in relation to the government has appeared which in my opinion is very important. On the one hand is the critical attitude, the adding the final touches to or the postponing of the implementation of some measure or other being proposed by the government. On the other hand, there is also confidence in the government. When some deputies, on these latest government proposals, proposed that the question of confidence in the government altogether be raised, the Supreme Soviet rejected this proposal by a vote of two thirds, and supported the government. Moreover, this was said: If we have expressed confidence in the government, we must let it work.

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] The chance, give it the chance, give it time.

[Lukyanov] Yes, and it must be seen that the major business in which we are engaged is a whole revolution. It cannot be done in one go. The government must be given the chance to work on it, and cooperation within this triangle—Supreme Soviet, president, government—is of exceptional importance here.

[Lyubovtsev] Anatoliy Ivanovich, this is what I would like to ask you about now: If our talk, our conversation now were live, as we say, then many television viewers would probably phone to ask about the interrelations between the USSR Supreme Soviet and the First Congress of People's Deputies and the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation [RSFSR] which has been elected now. How do you appraise their work, and how are your relations with the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet taking shape? Are you prepared to cooperate with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin?

[Lukyanov] Well, I would say that it seems to me, for example—I was at the congress, at the first session, and then could not attend only because we had a session in progress—that in general this is a definite step in the development of our democracy, in Soviet democratism. I have a respectful attitude toward its decisions, and consider that what has been elaborated in a democratic fashion should be respected and developed. Yes, we have been criticized. The Supreme Soviet was criticized, as was the congress, at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. Some of the criticism was correct; some could not be agreed with, but at the same time I noticed that the congress accepts our experience. Experience—and even negative experience—is experience.

[Lyubovtsev, interrupting] All the same...

[Lukyanov continuing] So the congress accepts this experience, although it citicizes us, as well. We have not by-passed this criticism. Several deputies raised the issue at the Supreme Soviet, and we agreed that relations now are quite good. We agreed in the Supreme Soviet that we will respond to this criticism with actions, first and foremost with actions. As far as my relations with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin are concerned, from a personal point of view I never have had any conflict with him. We will work in a business- like and constructive fashion. We will argue. Our positions on a whole series of issues are different. We will seek joint decisions, serious decisions, but I do not have to work only with Boris Nikolayevich. I also have to work with the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of all of the other union republics; in, let us say, just as close contact with, let us say, Comrade Vladimir Antonavich Ivashko, who has just been elected chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukraine, with Nikolay Ivanovich Dementey, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Belorussia, and with all the other comrades. That is, we are working together and I very much hope that this will be contact that is necessary for our society, between the higher body of power of the Soviet Union and the union republics. Only together can we overcome the situation in which we find ourselves. It is for this reason that I have cited our resolution on this issue.

[Lyubovtsev] May it be considered that this address you have mentioned to the leaders of the parliaments of the republics, both the autonomous and union republics, is the beginning of a lengthy cooperation? It concerns an issue that is so painful now as the transition to the market economy, but many other problems also have arisen in our country.

[Lukyanov] Viktor Ivanovich, it is a continuation of cooperation. In no way can I brush aside the experience accumulated through the interaction among the highest bodies of power of the union and the republics, experience that dates back many years. It will be a continuation of cooperation: at a new stage, with a new quality, with a new direction, but a continuation of cooperation, a way forward. I want to say again that it will not necessarily involve keeping step, but it will be in one direction. This is the main thing.

[Lyubovtsev] In conclusion, Anatoliy Ivanovich, parliamentary holidays are beginning, or to be more precise, have begun already. All in all, however, life does not make it possible to catch one's breath and have a rest. What do you think? From what will the fourth session begin its work on 3 September? What important, pressing questions will it have to tackle right from the start?

[Lukyanov] First an foremost, I wish to say that parliamentary holidays are, of course, a relative concept. The deputies now will go home. They are beginning to leave already. The first thing they will do will be to meet the voters. They will describe our work, our shortcomings, our successes, and everything alike. People will judge this. We will be given an additional impetus from the people, for the first time. On the other hand, already it is clear, of course, what will take place in September, during the next session. That is why yesterday, at the sitting of the Supreme Soviet Presidium, we drew up a definite plan of work for the fourth session. What questions will these be?

Above all, we will have to resolve questions that we will be continuing with in September. These are questions connected with the introduction, the entry into the controlled market relations, the government's program on this score. There are many questions here. The plan and budget for next year have to be passed; apart from this, a whole series of legal acts has to be passed: In all, the package contains 108 legal acts. Some 20 acts will have to be examined during the coming session. The approximate list of these acts looks like this: There are acts on the freedom of economic activity and the development of enterpreneurship, on the new foundations of civil laws, on the foundations of antimonopoly laws, on the employment of the population, on banks and their activities, on small enterprises, on price reform, on joint enterprises.

[Lyubovtsev] Anatoliy Ivanovich, let me just ask one question: What about the new Union Treaty?

[Lukyanov] The Union Treaty is a special case. It will be prepared during the course of this work, and the president—this was debated at a sitting of the Soviet of the Federation—has set up a group of people—comprised of representatives of all republics, approximately two representatives and a large group of experts—and they will be working directly on the Union Treaty. It must be said that we already have several variants of this treaty. I think that by the session the union treaty will be agreed on with the republics, to some extent. It subsequently will be examined by the Supreme Soviets of the union republics, and evidently, in the final analysis, it will be passed by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies. So, this is this great program of ours.

The only other thing I would like to say, in addition, taking this opportunity of talking to those who represent the television, is that never before has there been such an abundance of letters and appeals from citizens to us, the Supreme Soviet, the commissions and the deputies. Moreover, these are not just appeals or complaints regarding some specific issues. I am talking about a multitude of proposals, remarks, and amendments of all kinds, thorough amendments to draft laws. All this is being sent to us.

[Lyubovtsev] What are the approximate numbers?

[Lukyanov] The number is this: I mean only during the first half of the year we received 400,000 letters and appeals, more than 400,000, and I do not include appeals to deputies in this number, for otherwise it would be one million. One million! Thirty-one thousand citizens who arrived here were received personally. Deputies themselves and representatives of commissions received some 2,000. We had to examine very many letters. I should mention that very many people write to me. I now have discovered that I have very many kith and kin throughout the country, people with the same surname, for Lukyanov is a very widespread surname. There are good wishes there, too, and I am very grateful to all the comrades who turn to me. However, there is also healthy and helpful criticism along the lines that I should do this, or that in such and such a way. In principle, however, I must say that it is enormous support and a huge impetus for our work. Not a single letter should be shelved. Everything must be looked into. It is a concentrated will of the people, the will of the electors, and I think that just as has been the case during this session, the Supreme Soviet will justify this trust. It is a difficult thing, and we do see the shortcomings, but we will endeavor to proceed together with our voters, our people, our perestroyka; to proceed forward and do our work, to combine words and deeds correctly, to combine the law and its execution. We simply have no other way.

[Lyubovtsev] Thank you very much for talking to us.

Gorbachev Greets Scientific-Industrial Union

LD1606105690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1002 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 June (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev has sent greetings to those attending the constituent congress of the USSR Scientific-Industrial Union [Nauchno-promyshlennyy Soyuz SSSR], which opened today.

The greetings message notes that the union's program of action, presented by a group of USSR people's deputies, is in keeping with the revolutionary reforms that are being implemented within the country. Mikhail Gorbachev stresses that the road toward a regulated market economy, on which the country has embarked, is the road toward economic freedom for the consumer and toward broad opportunities for each person to realize his aptitudes and talent, and to receive due remuneration for his labor. In these conditions, the Union can, and must, become a real force in overcoming crisis phenomena and in developing positive trends in the country's economy.

Gorbachev 'Ready for Cooperation' With Yeltsin

PM1506144490 London ITV Television Network in English 1800 GMT 12 June 90

[Interview with Nikolay Shishlin, adviser to the CPSU Central Committee, in English by correspondent David Smith in Moscow on 12 June—recorded]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] [Smith] Looking at what's happened in Russia today, how significant is Yeltsin's declaration of sovereignty?

[Shishlin] I think that's an important step and in some ways that's a challenge to our president; but I think that's a good challenge, because the aim of Gorbachev is to reconstruct our state and to have a new union treaty. So, I think this challenge will accelerate the policy of perestroyka, will accelerate and speed up the policy of reforms.

[Smith] But isn't there a danger of the Soviet Union simply disintegrating—because is this still the Soviet Union after today?

[Shishlin] I think that we'll have new ties between republics and I believe in the fate of the Soviet Union. Yes, now we have very serious process, but they are normal in the framework of reconstruction [sentence as heard]. So I think we'll overcome our difficulties.

[Smith] How much of a threat do you think Yeltsin is now to Gorbachev?

[Shishlin] Look, yesterday Yeltsin had some conversations with people who are quite close to Gorbachev, and he said it's necessary to forget about the past and he is ready for cooperation. And I think that was a serious declaration.

[Smith] Is Gorbachev ready for cooperation—you know him, I mean?

[Shishlin] Yes, he's ready, he is ready.

[Smith] What is the president going to do about Yeltsin? Is he going to bring him back into the government?

[Shishlin] I think it's not necessary, because Yeltsin now occupies a very important post, a very important position, and he can do a lot. And I want to think that he'll do something good.

[Smith] But can Gorbachev work with Yeltsin? After all the animosity, the bitterness of the past?

[Shishlin] Politics—that's severe thing [as heard]. So it's necessary to overcome your emotions, and I think that Gorbachev will do this, and will cooperate with Yeltsin.

[Smith] Because he has no other way?

[Shishlin] Because life demands such steps. It's necessary to consolidate all the forces, and I think that Yeltsin can be a partner of Gorbachev, not a rival

Ligachev, Yeltsin Clash at Peasant Union

PM1506151390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Report by V. Gavrichkin and V. Konovalov: "Peasant Congress: Applause for Ye. Ligachev and B. Yeltsin"]

[Text] The plot of the USSR Peasant Union's constituent congress remained taut right through to the finale as a result of the participation of two striking figures who have opposed one another in the political struggle in recent years—B. Yeltsin and Ye. Ligachev.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary went to the rostrum on several occasions, made a significant program statement, and even participated in the election for Peasant Union chairman as a candidate. Then the chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Repoublic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet addressed the delegates, answered their questions, and set out his program positions.

Of course, in many respects their pronouncements conflicted with one another. Primarily on the chief question in terms of the agrarian economy and, indeed, the country's economy as a whole.

B. Yeltsin said that he regards the peasant-owner, owner of the land as well as the means of production, as the foundation of the development of the agrarian sector, that his right to freely choose the forms of management should be guaranteed, and that party organizations should not interfere in production activity.

Ye. Ligachev confirmed that he firmly advocates social ownership as a priority and said that the mistakes in agriculture were due to the party committees' relaxation of their influence in the economic sphere.

Ye. Ligachev said that he had withdrawn as a candidate for the post of Peasant Union chairman because he had to continue and bring to a conclusion his political struggle in what he called a dangerous time for the party and state. He believes that the current line of the country's leadership could result in the disintegration of the Soviet federation. It is concession upon concession, he said, and if we carry on making compromises forever, all could be lost. Ye. Ligachev announced that he had set out this position in several memoranda he had recently sent to the CPSU Central Committee and Politburo and he would stick to his principles. The Central Committee secretary urged the congress participants to consolidate forces capable of bringing order to the country. The response was tumultuous applause.

B. Yeltsin was applauded too.

We should not conclude from this that the congress participants would have listened to anyone and applauded anyone. It was more a reflection of the the diversity and contradictions present in the congress and the national peasant union it set up.

It is clear that the creation of the peasant union, however you look at it, is a significant event. For the first time in the years of Soviet power, you might say, a public organization has been formed that aspires to an indepemndent policy in the matter of protecting peasants' interests and consolidating the efforts of all working people in the agroindustrial sector of the country's economy. At any rate, that it was the peasant union's program documents say.

What actually happens the immediate future will tell. But already, by analyzing the congress discussion and the documents and statements adopted at it, we can detect and interpret the key elements that are most likely to occur at the heart of the new union's policy. And we must interpret them, irrespective of whether the union's ideologists like it or not.

If we were to encapsulate the leitmotiv of the congress speeches, we would say that its content is succinctly expressed by just one demand addressed to the state and the whole of society: "Gimme!" Gimme material resources, gimme fair prices, gimme an agriculture ministry and agricultural supply administration [Agrosnab], means for the provision of social amenities in the countryside, and much more. And the state is to give it all, of course; where it finds it is its own business.

Perfectly understandable demands. Given the current neglected state of practically all sectors of agriculture and produce processing and storage and the wretched social condition of the countryside, we are certainly not going to solve the very acute food problem. Examples of this, cited in nearly all of the speeches, made it clear that the priority development of the agrarian sector is a matter of urgency.

But, having convincingly demonstrated the wretched state of the countryside, the delegates merely described the consequences, while, unfortunately, virtually ignoring the causes. Admittedly, kolkhoz Chairman M. Chartayev and some other speakers tried to talk about it, but their ideas were either given the slow handclap or were not given due attention. Yet the roots of the problems lie in the very substance of all past agrarian policy. The very policy that deprived the peasant of the right to own land and other means of production, turned him into a hired hand with no interest in the results of his labor, and destroyed the whole rural way of life. Even now efforts to make a kolkhoz or sovkhoz autonomous and give it the right to own the land and what it produces, but leave the peasant in the position of a day-laborer appear idealistic at the very least.

We cannot see it—new "infusions" into the countryside will not guarantee success. The congress could not see it either. But there was severe criticism of the USSR President, who, in his criticism of V. Starodubtsev at the meeting with lessees allegedly insulted all peasants.

Let us remember what was being discussed. The president singled out in his speech the three key questions that have to be solved—the need for new production relations and ownership relations, scientific-technical progress, and the provision of social amenities for the countryside. Which should take priority and be the element that is capable of bring all the rest up to scratch? The provision of social amenities? Yet there are farms and even entire regions in the country where the countryside does not look neglected at all, and yet efficiency is not commensurate with investments. Progress? Progress will not be productive if the management structures are not conducive to innovation. Investment pure and simple... The example of the Nonchernozem Zone shows that investments worth many billions have been made, but, as it happens, not in the right place and into the wrong hands. So the answer is self-evident.

V. Starodubtsev's position, shared by the majority of the congress, which consisted overwhelmingly of leaders, was different: Give us more investments; we favor equality of all forms of management, but kolkhozes and sovkhozes get priority. Here, as we can see, equality is mere camouflage.

And it was no accident that the congress delegates linked the priority development of the agrarian sector to state appropriations and administrative structures — demands to create an Agricultural Ministry, Agricultural Supply Administration, and so on. The fact that the country is switching to a market economy and its prosperity will no longer come from allocation schedules, but will have to be earned on the basis of initiative and commitment—this strategic question was not considered by the congress. What is it: stupidity or a conscious rejection of the fundamental political line of perestroyka? Life will provide the answer.

...Contrary to press reports, the congress has not ended at all, but has merely adjourned for a year. The delegates decided that they would meet again in the same form, without any new elections. Thus they have kept their seats and their powers. What about their positions?

Miners' Congress Ends, New Union Discussed

LD1506193690 Moscow TASS in English 1851 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Anatoliy Gordeyev and Vladimir Yurkevich]

[Text] Donetsk, Southeastern Ukraine, June 15 TASS—The First Congress of Miners of the Soviet Union ended its work here today.

For five days representatives from the majority of the country's coal basins were discussing their professional and social problems. The creation of an independent miners' trade union was in the focus of attention and provoked heated discussion. The majority of speakers dwelled on the issue.

Opinions were extremely divided. Some of delegates insisted on the creation of a new, independent from the existing one, coal miners' trade union. Others suggested reforming inside the existing one.

A resolution on the issue reads that delegates will discuss draft rules of a new trade union, its structure and ways to form its ruling bodies with their work collectives.

Miners adopted a resolution on Soviet miners' social and economic situation, the implementation of a state regulation brought about by last summer's strikes and the branch's work in conditions of a market economy.

Delegates decided by a majority vote to convene the Second Soviet Miners Congress in August in Moscow. The congress is expected to found a new miners trade union and elect its leading bodies.

Chernobyl Survivors' Congress Forms Union

LD1706230690 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Aleksey Petrunya and Andrey Chirva]

[Text] Kiev, the Ukraine, June 17 TASS—About 100 regional organisations and movements in the Soviet Union that unite survivors of the 1986 Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident and those who participated in the cleaning up of the accident's consequences, have held their first congress in Kiev.

The three-day congress, which closed today, proclaimed the formation of a Chernobyl Union, which will extend relief aid to Chernobyl survivors in cooperation with the government and local authorities.

It was said at the congress that 50,000 out of 600,000 participants in the clean-up efforts had lost ability to work and that several thousand of them had died. Speakers also denounced the callousness of bureaucrats.

The congress discussed the structure of the new public organisation, the status of Chernobyl accident survivors and the strengthening of the union's material basis, which would make it possible to extend relief aid to them.

Biryukova Examines Improving Living Standards

WA1306190190 Moscow UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 22, May 90 p 5

[Report on interview with Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, by UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA's M. Popov; date and place not specified: "'Shock Therapy?' The Government Is Absolutely Against It"]

[Text] **"We cannot and we will not lay down a program that leads to a drop in the people's living standard," declared Aleksandra Pavlovna Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, in an interview with UCHITELSKAYA GAZETA.**

[Popov] Aleksandra Pavlovna, it is no secret that a majority of people believe: There are no serious changes for the better in the social sphere. What do you, as chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, think of this?

[Biryukova] Unquestionably, life is not easy now. Everyone is tired of empty counters, of more and more essential goods falling into the shortage category, and of the disarray in the supply sphere, health services, and community facilities... Only I think that to get the full and objective picture one should also see what the state and the government have been able to accomplish by holding firmly to the main direction—the subordination of economic development to the interests of the people.

First of all, I would like to note the fundamental changes in the distribution of national income. The share expended on consumption and on construction not intended for production in 1989 constituted almost 84 percent compared with the 80 percent envisioned in the five-year plan. This year it will reach 86.7 percent. Never in the entire history of the country have we seen this kind of an indicator before.

Further, the volume of capital investments for the development of the non-production sphere was increased sharply. Investment for the needs of health services, culture, and public education was almost doubled in 1986-1989 in comparison with the corresponding period of the last five-year plan. In these four years, the assigned tasks were overfulfilled with respect to housing, schools, hospitals, and outpatient clinics. The average annual introduction of housing increased in the current five-year plan in comparison with the last one by 16 percent; schools and outpatient clinics by 38 percent; and old people's homes by 76 percent.

[Popov] Outwardly, the figures look rather convincing. But, speaking frankly, somehow the real fruits of these achievements are not being felt. What is the matter here?

[Biryukova] I would not say that the results of the social policy of the state are still not being felt. Here it is necessary to look specifically at each direction.

Let us look at the situation in the individual social groups. In recent years, salaries have been increased for teachers, physicians, workers in higher educational institutions, miners, and railroad workers. A study is being completed on the question of an increase in the salary of workers of pre-school institutions.

And measures to strengthen the social protection of the people? More was done in this area during the years of perestroyka than during the previous several decades.

The Law on Pensions. This, perhaps, is the most important social measure in all the years of Soviet rule. It encompasses approximately 60 million persons. According to findings of the International Labor Organization, the law belongs among those that are the most progressive. I will note that there are probably few countries in the world where the law would fix such early ages for going on pension, such a short period of labor service to receive a full pension, and such a wide circle of professions, specialities, types of production, etc., that have a right to preferential pensions.

Incidentally, the law assures teachers the right to go on pension due to length of service, with a 30-year teaching period for urban school teachers, and a 25-year teaching period for rural school teachers.

I will also mention the draft USSR Law "On Leaves." This is the first such law in the history of the country. It raises the minimal leave to a level provided by the International Convention, and, specifically, up to 21 calendar days. Its adoption will improve the situation of 90 million workers. In particular, almost 80 million persons, or 40 percent more than now, will be able to enjoy leaves of 28 and more calendar days.

The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a resolution "On Urgent Measures to Improve the Position of Women, Maternity Protection, Child Care, and Strengthening the Family." The government is preparing a State program to improve the position of women. By direction of the government, the USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Social Development, jointly with the Central Committee of the VLKSM [All- Union Leninist Communist Youth League], the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions] and other departments, and social organizations are readying a draft USSR Law "On the General Principles of a State Youth Policy in the USSR" and a Concept of Basic Principles and Directions of State Youth Policy. A decree of the USSR Council of Ministers was adopted which defines additional measures to improve the social and living situation of students. A State program for assistance to invalids is being worked on. This will be the first document in our country which encompasses all aspects of the life and work of invalids, and assistance to them on the part of the state and society.

As a result, in 1990 expenditures on implementing centralized measures to raise the people's standard of living exceeds the resources earmarked for this year in the five-year plan by a factor of 3.6.

[Popov] But one learns from the mass media and speeches of people's deputies on the radio and television about newer and newer proposals to increase salaries, the size of pensions, and other supplementary benefits...

[Biryukova] I will say frankly that many of these proposals do not take into account the real capabilities of the country and the current extremely complicated situation in the national economy. It becomes necessary to mention a well-known truth: The country cannot live better than it works. If we want to raise the level of prosperity and to strengthen social protection, it is necessary in the first place to think about how to prepare, figuratively speaking, the public pie, and only afterwards, how to slice it up better and more fairly.

The USSR Council of Ministers and the governments of the union republics are applying all of their energies to increase the production of consumer goods. Although it was not possible to complete in full measure what was planned, the output of consumer goods increased by 26 percent in four years, including non- production commodities by 31 percent. This is more than in the same period in the previous five-year plan. Moreover, the growth was not only a result of the price factor, in rubles, but it was also seen in real indicators: pieces, meters, etc.

Nevertheless, the population did not feel the increase in the production of consumer goods. Store shelves are not getting any fuller, but rather the opposite. One of the main reasons is that the monetary income of the population is growing significantly faster than the output of commodities and the volume of paid services. Another reason is the disproportions in the structure of our economy that have developed over decades. Today, only 12 percent of the total industrial potential of the country functions in the production of articles for the population. Time is required to eliminate this defect and to ensure a substantial increase in the output of commodities.

The government is working in this direction consistently. In 1990 it is planned to exceed the growth of commodities achieved last year by a factor of three. In particular, it is proposed to increase the delivery of television sets to the market by 1.37 million units, refrigerators by 700,000 units, and vacuum cleaners by 2.3 million units. I want to assure you that these figures are quite realistic. They are supported by an increasingly tangible return from the conversion of the defense sector of the national economy, the priority allocation of material-technical resources to the production of commodities, and a number of other economic and organizational measures.

[Popov] According to data from the Center for Sociological Research of the AON [Academy of Social Sciences] under the CPSU Central Committee, more than half of those polled (53 percent) favor shift to a ration card system as a way out of the situation that has developed in the supply of commodities. What do you think of this opinion?

[Biryukova] The government of the country is united on the fact that the introduction of a ration card system on the scale of the entire country is unwarranted, because it does not resolve the problem in principle: It does not stimulate an increase in the output of commodities and, consequently, it does not lead to a saturated market. We proceed from the fact that a radical improvement in matters of satisfying the demand of the population depends directly on a radicalization of economic reform and the formation of a regular market mechanism.

At the same time, in certain cases the Councils of Ministers of the union republics and the local soviets in one or another form favor the introduction of a rationed consumption of individual types of commodities. As a temporary measure that is dictated by a specific situation in a region, this, apparently, is warranted. It is important only that republic and local organs of authority not limit themselves to these measures, but that they persistently seek ways to eliminate shortages and improve the supply of consumer goods to the population. This is their real responsibility.

Economic

Maslyukov Comments on Price Increases

LD1506135990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1255 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Mineyev]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—The Soviet Government is satisfied with the results of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet which ended yesterday. This was stated by Yuriy Maslyukov, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of the State Planning Committee of the USSR. He met journalists today at the press center of the Russian Party Conference and of the 28th CPSU Congress.

The government's concept of the transition to a regulated market economy has been "practically adopted", he stressed.

The package of laws adopted by the Soviet parliament, in the words of Yuriy Maslyukov, "predetermines the irreversibility of the transition to the market economy." In September the government should present to the Supreme Soviet a specific program of works on the transition to the market, he recalled.

Touching upon the government proposals on the rise of the price of bread and grain products, Yuriy Maslyukov termed as "correct" the decision of the parliament on the additional examination of this question by the country's government jointly with the presidiums of the Supreme Soviets of the union republics. "A mistake here will lose confidence in the government," he stressed, noting the importance of the "full guarantee of social justice and of complete compensation for this step to ensure that no group of the population suffers, and especially the poorly provided for."

Journalists also touched on the convertibility of the ruble. Yuriy Maslyukov stated that its "exchange rate must be lowered several-fold." "We shall embark on devaluation to bring the ruble exchange rate closer to its world assessment", he said, noting also the need for efforts to reduce the budget deficit and the outlay on capital construction, defense, and aid to foreign states.

According to him, the government intends by 1992-93 to have implemented a complex of measures to achieve the internal convertibility of the ruble. In 1993 it is proposed to allow the reinvestment of rubles earned by western firms in the USSR for the development of the property of these firms in the Soviet Union. "By 1995 we are planning to achieve full convertibility and to allow the export of profits in currency for joint enterprises and for foreign investors," he stated.

Answering a question about the results of the recent meeting between Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov and Kazimiera Prunskiene, head of the Lithuanian Government, Yuriy Maslyukov stated that beginning from 16 June 3.5 million cubic meters of natural gas will be supplied to Lithuania for the specific purpose of starting up a chemical fertilizer works. It is, he said, "a gesture of good will and of striving by the USSR leadership to speed up the transition to talks".

Prices Chief Defends 'Phased' Market Switch

PM1406143590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences V.K. Senchagov, chairman of the USSR State Committee on Prices, by V. Romanyuk under the rubric "Facing the Market"; place, date not specified: "Where Will the Prices Pendulum Swing?"]

[Text] [Romanyuk] Vyacheslav Konstantinovich, we have long been intimidated with the idea that the introduction of a market economy will lead to a surge in prices. Now it even seems that the extent of this surge is being programmed. Forgive me, but can it really be a market economy if the price of everything is going to be prescribed from the top?

[Senchagov] I agree that a market economy pivots around free price formation or, to be more precise, market price formation. But those in favor of a free market do not realize that totally unrestricted growth in prices would far exceed the level we are setting in our price reform. We are "cleansing" prices of unnecessary expenditure and unproductive outlays and losses. In short, we are creating a certain filter against bad management. As far as the concept of independence and freedom is concerned, it does not appear in a market economy overnight.

The present price system was formed under the influence of the administrative-edict system, in which commodity-money relations were given the role of maintaining formal economic accountability, while cost indicators had the function of an accounts mechanism in the planning of production and distribution of output. The result is that prices have become alienated from the economic interests of both the producer and the consumer and do not reflect either costs or the usefulness of the manufactured product. In our country there is no connection between wholesale and retail prices: This connection is restored through subsidies, which now amount to R96 billion for foods, or one-fifth of budgetary expenditure.

[Romanyuk] We are used to taking pride in the stability of our prices....

[Senchagov] Or in their static nature, to be more precise. This has led to our totally ignoring the balance of supply and demand, the dynamics of world prices, and the state of the market generally—it may be deformed, but it does exist nevertheless.

[Romanyuk] And now the desired switch to a market economy. As is well known, of all the possible options for transferring to a market economy, we have chosen the one that is perhaps the most moderate.

[Senchagov] I would put it like this: moderate-radical. By choosing the option of making a phased transition to a market economy, we have preferred to combine economic mechanisms with levers of administrative, state regulation. It would be extremely risky to free all prices at once. Free price formation on a large scale would be damaging to the country. Take coal, for example. The coalfields with the greatest production costs will act as price regulators. This means that prices will rise four or five times over. The situation with oil and gas is the same.

[Romanyuk] Do you believe that the market will definitely work to maximum? Perhaps the most expensive coal simply will not be bought and unprofitable output will be forced to quit the market?

[Senchagov] That is exactly what happens in a market that is functioning normally. But the lack of balance of our own market has exceeded all reasonable limits. Add to this the absence of antimonopoly legislation and the diktat of the producer giants: Prices will nevertheless go to the maximum. It is tempting, of course, to create a competitive base immediately so that the strong triumph and the weak are driven from the economic arena in a day. But, I repeat, this is not going to happen overnight. We have to form a market infrastructure making it possible to easily transfer loss-making enterprises to the manufacture of profitable goods, resolve employment problems, and transfer capital from one sector to another. But at the moment those structures of the planned economy which must grow into market economy structures are not developed.

[Romanyak] So develop them!

[Senchagov] That is easier said than done. I have studied the organization of joint-stock companies and the antimonopoly business in Japan and I must say that these are very finely tuned instruments. We will have to start by eliminating the scandalous distortions in prices and money circulation. A strong ruble must be master in the economy. So that everyone pays court to it rather than to those who "sit" on resources.

It is important to bear in mind that prices are not only an instrument of management: They also serve as the basis for gauging costs and results. This was made clear by the fathers of economic reform in the fifties and sixties, but the "children" have apparently forgotten about this and live with naive ideas about a market economy. People say to us that recommended prices are "inventions" of the State Committee on Prices and belong in the past, that we are trying to build them into the new mechanism. But, you know, the price system is an element of any economic management system and prices are set by people, although the methods of deciding them and the degree to which they are linked to the market can undoubtedly vary.

Regarding attempts to leap into the free market sphere, the well-known American expert Samuelson observed that we want—and this is not the best option—to create "full-scale capitalism from the Charles Dickens era." Another Nobel Prize laureate, V. Leontyev, warned in one of his letters to the USSR that price formation with no one at the helm in a free market conceals not only powerful production incentives but also negative consequences: unemployment, unequal distribution of income, and environmental pollution. But, in his opinion, the centralized planning experienced by the Soviet Union can lead to even worse results. Hence his advice to "find a good combination of the actions of blind forces of private interest and the rational regulation of those forces."

[Romanyuk] Do you believe that you have managed to find that optimum combination?

[Senchagov] We are working toward a market economy by creating a collection of three types of prices: state prices (55 to 60 percent); regulated prices (25 to 35 percent); and free prices (10 to 15 percent). The first group covers the output of the fuel and energy sectors and the most important foods; the second group—some of the output of the machine-building, chemical, and petrochemical sectors, fertilizers, and plastics; and the third group—innovations and everything that works for scientific and technical progress. The borderlines between these groups are flexible. For example, the computer technology market has recently been taking shape not without some help from cooperatives: It is quite possible that these goods can be released onto the free market within six months, a year at most. And if we take clock plants, they had quite a good market even under the administrative system.

[Romanyuk] But prices have been dictated from above nevertheless....

[Senchagov] In many countries throughout the world, prices are indirectly monitored by the "Big Buyer" and there exist parity commissions which annually study the situation in the market and the correlation between price and wage increases (in Austria, for example, purchase prices are regulated in order to ensure equivalent exchange between rural and urban areas). Consumer baskets are analyzed in order to more correctly calculate the level of prices, price fluctuations, and the indexation of income. Our consumer societies have yet to come into their own, as they say. A unique incident occurred with the new model Moskvich: We originally set the price at R13,500, but the Technical Supervisory Service and specialists from the plant gave weighty arguments in favor of dropping the price to R12,100. The collective of the Moscow Lenin Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Motor Vehicle Plant, which sets itself high standards, did not want to issue modifications for the new model and demanded that the price be brought into line with....

[Romanyuk] ... With demand?

[Senchagov] Among other things. We must not forget, however, that the initial basis of any price is labor and its remuneration. Regulating supply and demand does not come down to prices. The fate of price reform itself depends on the degree of development of other elements of a market economy.

Price reform can reduce money surpluses, but there must also be channels through which this money can be used, and they are well known: a securities market, joint-stock companies, leasehold collectives, and so forth. The State Bank is obliged to hold the money supply in a certain equilibrium. This, incidentally, is one of the arguments why it is impossible to free all prices at the same time: The money supply would greatly exceed the physical volumes of output.

[Romanyuk] But can price rises in themselves really lead to a healthier economy?

[Senchagov] Price rises are not an aim in themselves. But, without them, it is impossible to talk seriously about balance between inherent value and price and it is impossible to eradicate such evils as universal shortages and endless waiting lines. Generally speaking, this is a really agonizing decision that the government has had to take and one it has been working toward for three years. As far as bread is concerned—the focus of so much upset nowadays—prices should have been raised ten years ago. We receive a great many proposals to revise bread prices even without compensation—just so long as the barbarous attitude to bread is stopped. Let us suppose, however, that we desist from raising bread prices. Grain purchase prices have gone up, you know: R9 billion per year. Where is this money going to come from? Either we will have to increase the budget deficit by that amount or we will have to exceed the limit for issuing money: by exactly R9 billion. Moreover, the bakery industry will drag out a miserable existence, as equipment in this vitally important sector in Moscow, for example, has not been renewed since the fifties. But the normalization of wholesale and retail prices for bread will create the conditions for retooling the bakery industry.

[Romanyuk] But what if the USSR Supreme Soviet, which has supported the introduction of new wholesale and purchase prices, puts its foot on the "emergency brake" in the retail price system and decides not to submit this question to the people?

[Senchagov] If the price system is separated into two different, opposite streams, it will be impossible to avoid an increasing imbalance: not only in the consumer market but throughout the entire economy. It is also impossible to cut off retail prices from the real cost of output and sale of output.

[Romanyuk] You also hear people saying this kind of thing: As we are going to have to survive two difficult years, would it not be sensible to create equal "start conditions," at least for people in the same profession? Or resolve outstanding pension problems through the price increases?

[Senchagov] Under no circumstances can price increases act as a springboard for implementing wage increases—no matter which categories of working people we are talking about. Prices and compensation are another matter entirely: There must be a strong link in this respect. And as far as leveling "start conditions" is concerned.... Tell me, what will change if we increase the number of banknotes in circulation? A surge in prices—and that is all. We are deluding ourselves that we would be helping the poor and the weak: In reality, this money would end up in quite different pockets. Of course, we could redivide everything according to fairness, as they say. But where are we going to find what we want to divide?

[Romanyuk] Allow me to ask you a delicate question. Some experts believe that, with the switch to a market economy with free prices, the USSR State Committee on Prices will not be needed at all. Indeed, where else in the world is there such a powerful department with such a ramified network of institutions?

[Senchagov] The USSR State Committee on Prices has 384 members of staff. If you include the republic network, our own science sector, and price inspectorates, the total comes to 8,000 personnel. In principle, you can find similar services in any country: the prices bureau which is part of Japan's economic planning administration, for example; the federal department for price control in Switzerland; the supreme council for prices which works under the auspices of the the Spanish Ministry of Economy, Finance, and Commerce; and so forth. Of course, in a market economy the committee's functions must substantially change, but the state cannot let price regulation out of its hands.

[Romanyuk] But to keep prices on a leash on such a scale!

[Senchagov] Approximately 10 to 30 percent of prices in the world economy are controlled directly, and an even greater percentage are controlled indirectly. In a small country like Switzerland the figure is 50 percent. But it is not just a question of percentages. We have to work out recommended prices, of course, but it is also important to analyze the factors involved in price changes and price "surges," draw up forecasts, calculate the average price index and price parity between urban and rural areas, and monitor prices as a whole. As is well known, it was "discrepancies" in prices that ultimately led to the collapse of the New Economic Policy. My answer to proponents of "popular economics" is this: Everything they propose could be done. Prices could even be "frozen" for a very short time. But, like a river which ultimately cannot be stemmed, they would burst through the dam.

So let us enter the cold water gradually. And another thing: We must have at least a rough idea of how free prices will affect the rate of growth in price inflation. With large-scale inflation, financial and monetary regulators will become less reliable and economic development will become more erratic. We have no right to allow that.

Economy's Problems, Prospects Considered

PM0706131190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with economist G. Khanin, by R. Lynev under the rubric "Face to Face With the Market"; place, date of interview not specified: "The Likely Costs of Transition"—first two paragraphs are an introduction]

[Text] Novosibirsk economist G. Khanin has been known among his colleagues for some time, but the reading public at large became familiar with his name only recently. The analysis of the situation and of the economy's prospects contained in his statements usually generates interest and, of course, a desire to argue.

Today's burning topic—the program for transition to the market—provided the subject of a conversation between him and an IZVESTIYA correspondent.

[Lynev] I recall that, in a series of your published articles, you not only argued with the official "crafty figures" which distort the economic picture, but also substantiated your own set of figures. The ensuing picture was quite different. But now the government has published the concept of transition to the market. Is it worth arguing with its analysis of the state of affairs in the economy? And does this analysis in itself not indicate that the government wishes to choose a correct starting position for the economy's transition to new market conditions?

[Khanin] I would agree that the government acted correctly by beginning its program with an appraisal of the present economic situation. But I cannot describe this appraisal as accurate and complete. There is no way it could be accurate for as long as it is based on Goskomstat [State Committee for Statistics] data which, as before and despite everything, distort the real picture. How can a disease be cured without a correct diagnosis?

[Lynev] What do you mean by "without"? The head of government admitted that the state of affairs in the economy is serious.

[Khanin] This hardly says anything at all. In actual fact, the economy is in a state of profound crisis for the second year running. This year's budget deficit will reach R80 to 90 billion. There can be no doubt at all that it will increase by year's end as the economic situation deteriorates. There are reports that emission during the first quarter reached the amount planned for the whole year. Even if the decline of output remains at the first quarter's level throughout the year—but it is more than likely to deteriorate further still—the volume of national income over the two years will have dropped 10 to 12 percent. Everything indicates that, with the present economic mechanism, the decline of output will continue. It will reach at least 20 percent over the next four or five years. As a matter of fact, this selfsame estimate is also contained in a U.S. CIA report dated 20 April. The scale of the crisis is comparable to the 1929-1932 crisis which shook the capitalist world, this was said by E.A. Shevardnadze speaking in New York last fall. But none of this—which is of paramount importance—is contained in the government report. It speaks of the gravity of the situation and its deterioration, but says nothing about the scale of the gravity and deterioration.

[Lynev] You mentioned the crisis of the thirties. Another memory springs to mind in this context—fascism was a product of that crisis.

[Khanin] That was in Europe. The United States, in contrast, found a way out of the crisis in Roosevelt's "New Deal" within whose framework the market economy managed to get its second wind and prove its viability.

Alas, our economy still lacks such opportunities. At this point I would suggest not thinking about what lies in store for our economy in the long term but looking at the next one or two years from the viewpoint of our foreign currency potential. The government program says little on this issue. It is, after all, no secret that so far we have succeeded in glossing over our economy's flaws with the help of imports, of foreign currency which was and still is used to acquire quite large quantities of foodstuffs, grain, medicines, consumer goods, and industrial materials. What is our foreign currency potential today, on the threshold of the market? Despite glasnost, official statistics and the press are silent on this point.

[Lynev] Indeed, we know the size of the gold reserve of Smetona's Lithuania but have no idea how much gold and foreign currency are to be found in our own, the all-people's purse as it were, how much is being spent and on what.

[Khanin] Alas, this must be worked out on the basis of estimates published abroad. For example, the Western press claims, with reference to CIA data, that our gold reserve stands at $28 billion, our annual gold extraction is 300 to 350 tons, and our foreign currency reserves stand at $14 billion. Judging by these data, the situation is not so bad. But how reliable are they? There have been, after all, many occasions when our economic situation has been embellished—and the CIA has played its part in this—no less than in the Goskomstat reports. For example, our gross national product was estimated "over there" as being 50 percent of the U.S. product. The figures quoted now are different, more accurate and less pleasant for us—not 50, but somewhere between 14 and 20 percent.

[Lynev] But this example is just an analogy, rather than direct proof that our foreign currency situation is two or even three times as bad.

[Khanin] The point is that, while not refuting Western data about the Soviet foreign currency potential, our official sources do not present their own accurate figures, they keep silent. And this generates suspicions—is it really accidental? Writing in the journal KOMMUNIST last year, the chairman of the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] Board promised the publication of information about our foreign currency reserves and gold extraction. I think that, taking advantage of this, IZVESTIYA could have reported on the state of our gold reserves. This would have made matters completely clear in our minds and would have provided a necessary guideline for our foreign partners in business deals with out country. For the time being, however, only an alarming—to put it bluntly—guideline has been provided by reports about a decline of our country's solvency which have appeared in the Western press.

[Lynev] S.A. Sitaryan, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, recently tried in IZVESTIYA to dispel the alarm by explaining that the defaulters are enterprises which have been given access to the external market rather than the state, that our rating—judging, in my opinion, by the FINANCIAL TIMES data—is quite high.

[Khanin] But this rating is again based on "their" data. What about our data? Sitaryan does not cite any. As for the enterprises, they hold some $600 to 700 million in external accounts—that was the figure mentioned in our country. This is not a lot in the total volume of our foreign trade. We have no knowledge of enterprises' commitments. Let me say this by the way: had our collectives been masters of their own property, they would have been much more cautious in obtaining credits.

Looking at things on a statewide scale, the journal IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS reported that last year our foreign trade deficit (excess of expenditure over foreign currency revenue) amounted to $12.5 billion, in other words close to the total of our foreign currency reserves. Our total foreign currency debt doubled and our net indebtedness trebled over the last four years. Add to this the fact that we sharply increased gold sales over the same period, and it becomes clear: we are in a bad state as regards foreign currency. How could it be otherwise? After all, the extraction of oil—our main export commodity—and its price have dropped.

[Lynev] At this point, let me ask you the same question that was asked of O. Latsis some 10 days ago: so, what is to be done? What do you suggest instead? In addition to the government program?

[Khanin] I was going to point out that my proposals do not contain anything that is fundamentally new when compared against proposals by other radical economists. But even in the government program, compared against last December's proposal, the new element is essentially just a price manipulation—raising them by R200 billion and offering compensation of R135 billion. The difference of R65 billion—we are being assured that this is the cost of delicacies and alcoholic beverages—will have to come from our pockets. Please note that all this is happening **prior to the market.** And **outside the market.** The government thus wants us to pay for the mistakes in its policy which led to the present crisis—its tardiness, its inconsistency in the implementation of reform.

[Lynev] And yet the Supreme Soviet, having sharply criticized the government program, had no intention of demanding its resignation. Judging by everything, the deputies attached importance to the argument that any acceleration of the pace of reform would produce a social shock.

[Khanin] What sort of shock? A total of 40 million unemployed? Who is likely to believe this, bearing in mind that our labor force today numbers 160 million. There are 60 million employed in industry, the construction industry, and the civil service. In my view, some 5 to 7 million will be released, most of whom will immediately find jobs—we have no manpower for the second and third shifts, the services sphere has been stripped bare. I am convinced that the 40 million unemployed are used to frighten the people into agreeing to an extension of the transition period which could prove to be more costly than if it were done quickly. Especially if, in addition to the aforementioned factors, we experience the effect of others like bad harvests (you must agree that nature has been kind to us over the last few years), a harsh winter (we have also been lucky with winters for three years running), and the ensuing paralysis of railroad transport and consequent fuel difficulties (fuel stocks in storage facilities are already approaching a critical level). Such conditions can be expected to produce a crisis in the community, outbreaks of diseases, and consequently a sharp rise in demand for medicines. What then, seeing that the pharmaceutical industry is also in difficulties? Purchase medicines abroad? But the foreign currency question was already discussed earlier. And all this will produce an inevitable growth of social tension, strikes, conflicts on ethnic grounds. Has the government taken all this into account?

You might say that I am laying it on thick. For my part, I am convinced that there are forces in our country that are interested in a worsening of the situation and, in the event of a total collapse of the economy, are prepared to push the country's leadership aside and rise to the top.

[Lynev] Are you, therefore, in favor of the Polish option for transition to the market?

[Khanin] I am in favor of a Soviet one. The Polish one would be impossible in our country if only because by the start of the reform Poland's population held $25 billion dollars—70 percent of all deposits. This was of great help in coping with the initial price rises and inflation. I estimate that the population in our country holds at most $1 billion. Of course, I do not mean the ordinary people.

What actually was the essence of the shock therapy in Poland? They introduced indexation—0.8 percent wages growth for every percentage point growth in prices. This automatically produces a 20-percent decline of living standards. I would suggest full reimbursement. We have the reserves to do this. Thus, **even with an accelerated transition option, we can and we must manage without any shocks, without major losses for the population.**

It is said: prices in our country may rise tenfold. Yes, they may, but this is no catastrophe. Growth in Yugoslavia and Brazil reaches 100 percent. There are cases of 2,000 and even 5,000 percent. We had as much in 1922. So what? Did the state collapse? No. The market set everything right. This is why a start must be made with the market.

But in order to achieve this there must be no delay in introducing free prices, private property, joint stock corporations, and free circulation of shares—on all of which the government hardly says anything.

Furthermore, we must take advantage of favorable factors which Poland lacks. Primarily the conversion of our defense industry complex which costs R200 billion a year (even though the government stubbornly gives a figure that is only one-third of this). This terrible burden must be transformed into the driving force of our economy, capable of supplying the domestic and foreign markets not with traditional consumer goods but with the latest output—ranging from laser video equipment to tomography instruments for medicine—as quickly as possible.

Then we have aid to foreign states. The Poles do not have this burden, while we provide aid worth $12 billion each year.

Nor should we forget that we have reserves of material assets worth several hundred billion rubles. There is a lot of surplus equipment. A part of it ought to be sold to the population, another part to developing countries, even at discounted prices—just like ANT [Automation, Science and Technology] tried to do.

There is also foreign involvement. In any form—concessions, leasing....

[Lynev] It was recently reported that a large group of U.S. business veterans are prepared to offer us their services. Many people, however, perceive a possible invasion by "foreign barbarians" as a "sellout of the motherland."

[Khanin] How much of the motherland did Peter I sell out as a result of his reforms, which quickly led the country out of its backwardness? I am convinced that the "sellout" thesis is planted in people's minds here and there by local leaders who are afraid that the "foreign barbarians" option will expose something that is no longer a secret for many people: their own business incompetence. I am also convinced that if a poll were to be taken in one or two years' time, the population would no longer object to open zones or foreigners since it will be sensing more and more acutely the incompetence of many of our leaders and specialists.

To sum up, I would say this: if the transition to the market is further put off, the reform will still have to be radicalized later on but in conditions that will be far worse than at present.

Resolution on Enactment of Pension Law Published

904A0389B Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 May 90 p 4

[Decree of the USSR Supreme Soviet "On the Procedure for Putting Into Effect the USSR Law 'On Pension Support for Citizens in the USSR'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet hereby decrees:

1. To put into effect the USSR law "On Pension Support for Citizens in the USSR" (henceforth called the Law) within the following time periods:

beginning 1 October 1990—the portion on pensions for disabled war veterans and other participants in the war;

beginning 1 January 1991—the portion on minimum amounts of pensions for other categories of pensioners; social pensions; pensions for individuals disabled since childhood as a result of injury, shell shock, or trauma related to combat actions during the period of the Great Patriotic War or to their consequences; pensions for children—orphans; mothers with disabled children (disabled since childhood of groups I and II); participants in the cleanup after the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant; and also the portion on the norms not pertaining to the amounts of the pensions. At the same time pensions are to be increased by R5 to 40 before the Law goes into effect, depending on the amount of time spent on the pension envisioned by Point 3 of the present decree;

beginning 1 January 1992—for newly assigned pensions and recalculation of other pensions before the present Law goes into effect (in keeping with tenure, earnings, and other factors envisioned by the Law minus the increase beginning 1 January 1991). Here pensions calculated in keeping with the present law in an amount in excess of R160 are paid: during the period up to 1 January 1993—up to R160 but no less than the amounts established beginning 1 January 1991, with an increase of R5 to 40; and beginning 1 July 1993—in the full amount.

But during the period up to 1 July 1993, in all cases the pensions are paid in amounts no less than those envisioned by legislation before the Law went into effect.

2. To abolish, beginning 1 January 1991, the restrictions on the right to an old age pension in increased maximum amounts established by Article 13 of the USSR law "On State Pensions" for workers and employees of the coal, metallurgical, and other branches of industry and construction who have left work, which gives them the right to the aforementioned pension before the introduction of the increased maximum amounts of pensions for these categories of workers.

For workers and employees for whom these increased maximum amounts of pensions have been established, to put the Law into effect beginning 1 January 1991 with payment of pensions before 1 January 1992 in amounts up to R210 and beginning 1 January 1992—in the full amount.

3. Pensions assigned before the introduction of the Law, including minimum ones, when recalculated are increased to the amounts established by the Law with a calculation of the corresponding additional payments, but no less than by R5 per month in cases when they have been receiving the pension up to five years inclusively, by R10—from five to 10 years; by R15—from 10 to 15 years; by R20—from 15 to 20 years; by R30—from 20 to 25 years; and by R40—25 years and more (for disabled war veterans and other participants in the war—not counting the increase envisioned by Articles 22 and 35 of the Law). Pensions for disability since childhood resulting from wounds, shell shock, or trauma related to combat actions during the period of the Great Patriotic War or their consequences and also pensions for the loss of the breadwinner for individuals disabled since childhood because of the aforementioned factors are increased by an additional 15 percent of the minimum old age pension.

When there is a subsequent increase in the minimum amount of the pension because of a growth in the minimum wage, the pension is recalculated without taking into account this increase of the pension by R5 to 40.

4. To establish that, regardless of the provisions of Article 67 of the Law, the time of work after the assignment of a pension before the Law goes into effect is taken into account when the amount of the pension is increased (Article 20 of the Law).

5. To retain the procedure in effect before the Law went into effect:

for assigning and paying pensions for cosmonauts and payments for length of service for workers in education and public health and sports figures (taking into account the right to choose a pension in keeping with Article 6 of the Law);

for including in the work tenure time spent in the occupied part of the USSR and other states during the period of the Great Patriotic War;

for including in the work tenure time spent abroad by wives of workers in Soviet institutions and international organizations;

for paying pensions to citizens who have traveled abroad, if this policy envisions better conditions than those established by the Law;

for calculating the increments to old age pensions for each year of work after the individual reaches pension age (but not before 1 January 1991) within the limits of the amounts calculated in keeping with Articles 20 and 76 of the Law with the corresponding work tenure in an amount of 10 times the minimum wage.

6. The USSR Council of Ministers; the councils of ministers of the union and autonomous republics; and the ispolkoms [executive committees] of the kray, oblast, city, and rayon soviets of people's deputies, in order to provide for prompt recalculation, assignment, and payment of pensions in keeping with the Law, are to develop and implement immediate measures for strengthening the material and technical base of the system of social security organs, supplying them more completely with modern computer equipment and means of communication and transportation, staffing them with qualified personnel, and improving the material incentives for workers of these organs.

Before 1 November 1990 the USSR Council of Ministers must:

adopt the necessary normative acts for applying the USSR law "On Pension Support for Citizens in the USSR" concerning questions the Law includes within the competence of the USSR Council of Ministers;

in conjunction with the AUCCTU [All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions], approve provisions on the USSR Pension Fund and also conditions and the procedure for citizens to pay mandatory insurance contributions to this fund and for citizens engaged in individual labor activity, including under conditions of individual (group) leasing or private peasant farms, to pay state social insurance;

with the participation of the AUCCTU, to complete the formation of lists of productions, shops, occupations, positions, and indicators that give the right to a preferential pension for length of service, having considered the proposals made during the course of the present session by USSR people's deputies pertaining to these lists;

submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals concerning the procedure and time periods for increasing pensions in connection with the cost of living index and the growth of wages (Article 124 of the Law) along with the draft of the Law on Indexing the Incomes of the Population.

when establishing the procedure for confirming work tenure (Article 74 of the Law), envision the possibility of confirming work tenure from eye-witness testimony for increasing the amount of the pension in keeping with Article 20 of the Law;

solve the problem of preferential pension support for medical and pharmaceutical workers who during the performance of their duties have been infected with the AIDS virus;

consider the question of including in the work tenure double the amount of time spent working in therapeutic institutions on territories with radiation pollution, in a communicable disease treatment facility for treatment of individuals infected with the AIDS virus or having the disease, and pathology-autopsy and resuscitation departments of therapeutic institutions;

submit to the USSR Supreme Soviet proposals for the introduction into existing legislation of changes and additions ensuing from the USSR law "On Pension Support for Citizens in the USSR," including changes in legislation on benefits in calculating work tenure for periods of work in regions of the Far North and locations on an equal footing with these regions.

The USSR Council of Ministers is to bring acts of the USSR Government into line with the USSR law "On Pension Support for Citizens in the USSR" and provide for the revision and abolition by ministries, state committees, and departments of the USSR of their normative acts, including instructions, that contradict this law.

To establish that the procedure for calculating the work tenure envisioned by Article 70 of the Law for workers in the rear and volunteers in military units during the Great Patriotic War extends to individuals who at working age were living in Leningrad during the period of its blockade and also individuals who were forcibly moved from the temporarily occupied territory of the USSR during the period of the Great Patriotic War to the territory of states that were at war with the USSR and prisoners, including children, of fascist concentration camps (ghettos and other places of compulsory detention during the war) unless they have committed crimes against the homeland during this period.

To grant to the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems, during the period of the pension reform and in keeping with the Law, the right to make decisions concerning the procedure for its application, including those pertaining to individual categories of citizens, which are mandatory for the ministries and departments of the USSR, the union and autonomous republics, local state administrative organs, and enterprises and organizations. Here the citizens retain the right to appeal to the courts in keeping with Article 102 of the Law.

7. Recommend to the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies to consider the proposals expressed by the USSR people's deputies during the present session concerning improvement of working conditions and benefits for pension support for agricultural workers (machine operators, field workers, vegetable growers, cotton growers, silkworm raisers, calf tenders, tea growers, horse breeders, cowboys, hothouse workers, poultry farmers, rabbit farmers, farmers who raise other animals, and those who raise and fatten cattle) and also reindeer herdsmen; shepherds; fishermen; hunters, including nomads; forestry workers; cable car conductors; offshore oil drillers; finishers employed in hand polishing of furniture; urban transportation drivers; certain occupations of workers employed in forestry, wood processing, and the pulp and paper industry; and also construction and energy engineering; cooks; bakers; confectioners; rug makers; and medical and pharmaceutical personnel; and, taking into account the peculiarities of their labor, adopt a decision in keeping with Articles 129 and 130 of the USSR Law "On Pension Support for Citizens in the USSR," the USSR Law "On the Fundamentals of Economic Relations of the USSR and the Union and Autonomous Republics," and the USSR Law "On the General Foundations of Local Self-Management and Local Business."

8. In order to finance expenditures related to the adoption of the Law to increase the rates of contributions for state social security paid by enterprises, institutions, and organizations—except for social organizations of disabled persons and pensioners—their enterprises, institutions, associations, and educational institutions, having set them in the amount of 37 percent along with the introduction of new wholesale and retail prices.

To establish mandatory insurance contributions from citizens to the USSR Pension Fund (Article 8 of the Law) in the amount of one percent of their wages.

9. The USSR Council of Ministers in conjunction with the USSR Academy of Sciences and the USSR Academy of Medical Sciences is to conduct work to prepare for a radical reform of the state preferential pension support, including for length of service, having limited the sphere of its application to specific branches where there are harmful or difficult working conditions or a danger to human health, regardless of the condition of scientific and technical progress, in order to subsequently turn over the solutions to these problems to enterprises and

organizations within the framework of collective agreements. To submit the corresponding proposals to the USSR Supreme Soviet before 1 January 1992.

To consider at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet the question of working conditions at enterprises of the country. To give instructions for the preparation of this question to the Commission of the Soviet Union for Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy; the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Protection of the Health of the People; and the Commission of the Soviet Union for Questions of the Development of Industry, Energy, Technical Equipment, and Technology.

10. The USSR Council of Ministers, taking into account the proposals made by USSR people's deputies during the course of the present session:

simultaneously with the submission to the USSR Supreme Soviet of the draft of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1991-1995 and the USSR State Budget for 1991, to submit proposals for a stage-by-stage increase in the minimum wage, keeping in mind the dependency of the minimum amount of the pension on the minimum wage;

to consider the question of the organization of recertification by medical-labor expert commissions of participants in war and other combat actions, including while performing their international duty, who during this suffered wounds, shell shock, or mutilation and were declared disabled as a result of general illness, for purposes of establishing a possible causal connection between their disability and the aforementioned wounds, shell shock, or mutilation;

in conjunction with the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Affairs of Women, Preservation of the Family, Maternity, and Childhood and the Committee of Soviet Women, in the formation of a program for improving the position of women in the country, to consider proposals related to early pensions for them, regardless of their age or whether or not they have lengthy work tenure;

in conjunction with the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Questions of Ecology and Rational Utilization of Natural Resources, when developing the ecology program to prepare proposals concerning forms of compensation to the population for their loss of health in cities and regions with critical ecological situations;

in conjunction with the corresponding committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet and permanent commissions of the chambers, to prepare and submit for the consideration of the USSR Supreme Soviet before 1 November 1990 proposals on questions of social protection and improvement of the material-living situation of individuals subjected to unjustified repressions and subsequently rehabilitated, their children, and also the children of prisoners in fascist concentration camps (ghettos other places of compulsory detention during the period of the Great Patriotic War);

to consider proposals concerning the procedure for calculating the work tenure of individual categories of citizens from nationalities that were forcibly moved from their permanent residences during the 1930-40s;

in conjunction with the Committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet for Protection of the Health of the People, the Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities on Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations, and the Commission of the Soviet Union for Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy, to consider proposals concerning the conditions and procedure for pension support for workers from small nationalities and ethnic groups of the Far North, Siberia, and the Far East and to report the results to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

11. To recommend to the supreme soviets of the union and autonomous republics and the local soviets of people's deputies that they implement on the basis of the Law measures for providing additional guarantees of social protection and improved living conditions for veterans of war and labor, disabled persons, and families who have lost their breadwinner, and especially for increasing concern for less well-off categories of pensioners.

[Signed] Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet A. Lukyanov, Moscow, The Kremlin, 15 May 1990

Reportage on Paper Shortage, Newspaper Publication

Timber Minister Explains

904A0413A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 8 Jun 90 pp 1,2

[Report on interview with USSR Minister of the Timber Industry Vladimir Melnikov, by RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA special correspondent V. Krukovskiy; place, date not specified: "Where Is the Roll Careening?"]

[Text] **Alarmed readers have been calling and writing to our editorial board: "Why is the publication of the paper disrupted?" In recent days, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA has not been published in Donetsk, Rostov, and Kiev; tens of thousands of subscribers have been left without their publications. On 3 June, Director of the CPSU Central Committee Publishing House V. Leontyev discussed the paper situation on the pages of RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA. We are continuing the discussion of this topic today.**

[Krukovskiy] Vladimir Ivanovich, what is happening in our country with the production of paper in general and newsprint in particular?

[Melnikov] If we say that there are difficulties in our country with paper we will be embellishing the situation. Our situation is extremely unfavorable. I must admit frankly that our industry has failed to respond "in a proper manner" to the "paper boom" caused by perestroyka. Paradoxically, the state order for the production of paper is being fulfilled, and our production capacity is being fully utilized. Nonetheless, the shortage in our country amounts to 200,000 tons, of which 100,000 tons is newsprint. In a word, only 60 percent of the needs for this product are being met.

[Krukovskiy] What does a minister feel under these circumstances?

[Melnikov] It is hard to keep your emotional balance when you realize that the paper issue is becoming a political issue. After all, in places one can already hear voices to the effect that the conservatives are "holding back" the paper on purpose in order to stop the development of glasnost. This is why I would like to take advantage of this opportunity to discuss this in somewhat more detail.

Our country ranks 42d in the world in terms of the level of consumption of paper and cardboard. In our country, it amounts to just over 37 kg per capita. In the United States, for example, it is more than 300 kg, in Sweden 235 kg, and in Finland 254 kg. We are also behind the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary....

The contrast is even more striking if we compare the per capita consumption of newsprint. In our country, it is just over six kg per capita, whereas in Sweden it is 44 kg, and in the United States over 50 kg.

[Krukovskiy] We are a great forest superpower, and suddenly we have this lag. Why?

[Melnikov] The underdevelopment of the pulp, paper, and timber industry, its low "contribution" to the overall volume of production of the national economy as a whole, is the main reason. Thus, "the gross output" of our complex, which is the most important for any civilized country, amounts to about one percent of total production in the USSR. Meanwhile, in developed countries this share is several times higher, and it continues to grow. On top of this, in recent years our pulp, paper, and timber industry has virtually ceased to develop. The average annual rate of development of the pulp and paper industry declined from nine percent in the eighth five-year plan to 1.6 percent in the current five-year plan. The commissioning of new capacities for the production of paper and cardboard declined by a factor of almost three, from 1.4 million to 550,000 tons. It is not that we lack willingness or initiative. It is just that this is what our investment policy was and still is at present. It will be difficult to improve the situation until this policy changes fundamentally.

[Krukovskiy] Pardon me, Vladimir Ivanovich, but even under these, to be blunt, difficult circumstances some details of the "paper" policy remain incomprehensible, if we don't say nonsensical, exacerbating the shortage. For example, this detail: At present, five percent of output remains at the disposal of the combines. These are 90,000 tons of newsprint and 49,000 tons of printing paper. Of this amount, publishing houses get only somewhat over 50,000 tons. The rest is exported or sold in a free domestic market. Moreover, despite this acute shortage, we deliver tens of thousands of tons of newsprint to foreign customers. At the same time, it is planned to purchase 150,000 tons for hard currency.

[Melnikov] Indeed, the state order for our combines comes to 95 percent of capacity. So, let us take away all 100 percent. However, this is a certain way to bring about complete ruin. The point is that our enterprises are almost completely outfitted with imported equipment, and absolutely do not have hard currency to purchase spare parts and equipment. The sale of paper abroad helps them at least to a degree.

It is not just for sale abroad. Some of these products are used for direct exchanges with other enterprises and industries of the country. The point is that the industry is far from being fully supplied with raw materials and chemicals. So, we have to wheel and deal somehow. We will not survive without this. As far as deliveries to foreign countries are concerned, I also believe that it is not very proper to sell elsewhere what we ourselves need so badly. We have proposed to the government to reduce the delivery of paper to the CEMA countries by 30,000 tons.

[Krukovskiy] Vladimir Ivanovich, why was the state order for the Balakhna Pulp and Paper Mill for this year reduced by 6,000 tons? Is this not the reason why central papers are now published with disruptions in a number of cities?

[Melnikov] Indeed, such a forced step was taken. The collective of the Pulp and Paper Mill proposed to carry out the reconstruction of three machines and to receive from them more than 100,000 tons of paper a year. Besides, it was resolved to purchase and install a new machine instead of machine No. 8, which has long been obsolete; this will result in another 200,000 tons of output. Where is currency to be obtained for this? This is how we resolved to take this, as they call it, "unpopular" measure which, however, to my mind is a correct one. After all, we have got to look for some way out of this situation. This is the first point. Second, the Kondopoga Combine assumed the obligation to produce the same amount of paper to be subsequently sold to the same consumers.

[Krukovskiy] Whatever you might say, the current paper famine does not appear absolutely unavoidable to me. Have you been in Pushkin Square and seen how many different newspapers are sold there? Where does, so to say, the firewood come from?

[Melnikov] Indeed, you are right, there is a question. Otherwise, how would the still new publications of informals and cooperatives appear? Their emissaries go to the paper combines purchasing newsprint whatever the price. For example, messengers from the Baltic area offer 10 tons of meat per ton of paper. A lot of paper "leaks" from our printing plants and the storage facilities of publishing houses.

[Krukovskiy] Vladimir Ivanovich, recently the paper mill in Kondopoga demanded that the PRAVDA Publishing House provide several ZIL-130 trucks and... 120 toilet bowls, and this had to be provided. Is this what the free market is about, or will the discipline of deliveries be maintained?

[Melnikov] Apparently, what is at issue is paper obtained above the state order. The market as such does not exist yet. So, we will comply with the state order strictly. However, the market is coming, and there is nothing that can be done about it. This is why the wise thing for the publishing houses to do is to prepare for it in advance. How? For example, contribute their investment funds for the development of the industry. Incidentally, the Balakhna Combine has already proposed to the PRAVDA Publishing House, and the Kondopoga Combine—to the IZVESTIYA Publishing House, to invest R100 to 150 million apiece in the production of newsprint, and thus become a virtual co-owner of the newly commissioned capacity.

[Krukovskiy] Let us sum it up. After all, what are the readers and publishers of newspapers to expect in the future?

[Melnikov] Unfortunately, I cannot promise you a bright future. The industry is taking measures to augment the output of paper. We have a program for increasing output by 630,000 tons by 1995 due to modernizing nine paper-making machines. In all honesty, this is little more than patching holes. Our country cannot do without building two or three large enterprises to produce pulp and newsprint. To this end, between R1.5 and 3 billion in capital investment are necessary. After all, R1 billion is necessary in order to increase the per capita consumption of paper and cardboard by one kilogram. This is why the problem of the industry will not be solved without resolute actions on the part of the government. The industry has been brought to its present lamentable status over quite a few years, and we can no longer procrastinate in this sphere.

We are fond of comparing ourselves with the West. So, in the United States the paper and cardboard-producing capacity will increase by more than 8 million tons in 1989 through 1991 alone, whereas in our country it will remain virtually the same throughout this period, at a level of merely about 11 million tons.

I do understand that the economic situation in our country is such that, supposedly, paper is not a priority. However, procrastination will only exacerbate the difficulties. To my mind, there are two ways to get out of the dead end. The first is to allocate sizable centralized investment funds. This is hardly possible given the current situation in the country. This is why switching to hard-currency self-repayment is a realistic way out. After all, for many years we have been milking this industry dry. Almost nothing is left for us out of the more than R2.5 billion in [hard] currency which the industry generates annually. The government should give us an opportunity to spend 70 to 80 percent of what we generate for the modernization of our industry. In this case, the paper industry would see to it that in as little as three to five years the supply of paper would outstrip demand. I am sure of this. However, time is short. The longer we delay solving this problem the more expensive it is going to be.

PRAVDA Stops Reaching Subscribers

PM1406132190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

["Alarm Signal" feature comprising dispatch by own correspondent Yu. Shcherbinin and commentary by N. Demidov, deputy editor of PRAVDA's Press and Journalism Department: "What About the Subscribers?"]

[Text] Volgograd—From 13 June PRAVDA will cease to be published in Volgograd. Publication of the newspapers SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, SELSKAYA ZHIZN, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, TRUD, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and SOVETSKIY SPORT ended two days earlier. The indignation of subscribers is boundless. Who is responsible for the interruption of the publication of the country's mass periodicals? And this is happening literally on the threshold of such extremely important political events as the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian Party Conference!

"We have no way out," N. Dzhurinskiy, director of the VOLGOGRADSKAYA PRAVDA Publishing House, comments. "None of the newspapers of the PRAVDA Publishing House which are printed in Volgograd have any paper..."

At the same time enterprises and commercial publications are buying up scarce paper by hook or by crook. Many new newspapers and magazines under departmental control have appeared in Volgograd. You constantly hear enterprising people say: "I got hold of two carloads of paper. Three more are in the offing." The impression emerges that the paper sector is supplying its output primarily to those who will pay more. Only recently for any issue of a newspaper to be delayed even by a few hours was considered an exceptional event, although there have always been problems with paper. And now?

"What are the prospects like?" I asked the publishing house director.

"As far as I know, not one carload of paper has been sent to us for the central newspapers."

Our Commentary

This alarm signal is by no means the first in recent times. We have spoken more than once already about the extremely grave situation with regard to the publication of newspapers in many major cities in the country. Readers—indeed, we newspaper people ourselves—are indignant but to no avail as yet. Information has been received from the the CPSU Central Committee

PRAVDA Publishing House about systematic interruptions in the publication of periodicals. Look at the places where it is happening: in Kiev this month the evening edition of our newspaper has not been published for 10 days running. People in Donetsk have failed to receive SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA six times and RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA an equal number of times. Add other towns as well—Astrakhan, Krasnoyarsk, Rostov, Kirov, Cheboksary.... In what way have the subscribers offended the paper industry in these places?

The most surprising thing is that the situation that has arisen obviously does not worry the USSR Council of Ministers at all. PRAVDA has repeatedly put its questions and proposals to this authoritative organ, but the reply has been silence as if it were a matter of some secondary problem. Meanwhile concern is being voiced in the central newspaper editorial offices: how can they provide their readers with information during the very important political events—the Russian Party Conference and then the 28th CPSU Congress?

We repeat: who will answer for the emergency that has arisen?

Press Circulation Criticized

PM1506212990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 p 1

[A. Kurmanov report, unattributed report under general heading: "All Newspapers Have Fewer and Fewer Readers..."]

[Text] Some 2,633,000 of our subscribers are not receiving KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA today.

As of 6 June we have been sounding the alarm every day for two reasons.

First, rumors of an impending price hike for newspapers and journals are persistently circulating. After which, they will simply lose subscribers.

Second, deliveries are simply being stopped to people who have not yet voluntarily given up their newspapers and journals. Without prior arrangement, so to speak. To be more precise, with prior arrangement. KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA was not published 14 June in Kishinev, Dnepropetrovsk, Kiev, Kirov, Krasnoyarsk, Simferopol, Arkhangelsk.... People are saying that things will get even worse. People are saying that there is no paper.

I would like to know the connection between these two circumstances. Is today's shortage meant to prepare the reader for the idea of the need for a price hike? Or is the price hike, as planned by the anonymous authors of this scheme, meant to cause demand to drop off and thus wipe out the shortage?

At any rate, either option would be a successful replacement for the Main Administration for Safeguarding State Secrets in the Press—called censorship in common parlance—of grievous memory. Incidentally, not even after the mass closure of newspapers and journals in 1917 could our censorship have dreamed on such scale.

In the last eight days KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has failed to reach almost half a million people.

The revolution continues?

Initial Response

The prevailing abnormal situation was condemned by the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. Having announced free subscription and obtained millions of rubles in advance payments from subscribers, government organs are not providing the requisite paper stocks for the publication of mass publications, thus violating their obligations. The existing press structures are effectively being destroyed.

The committee regards this as seriously detrimental to the policy of glasnost. The already tense situation is worsening, since readers have effectively been deceived.

The committee considers the prevailing situation extraordinary and quite inadmissible, and expects the government to take immediate steps to fundamentally rectify it.

Defense Ministry Hands Over Precious Metals

AU1206154790 Paris AFP in English 1457 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 12 (AFP)—The Soviet Defence Ministry is to hand over three tonnes of gold, 564 tonnes of silver and 300 kilograms (660 pounds) of platinum to the treasury, the PRAVITELSTVENNY VESTNIK newspaper reported Tuesday.

The precious metals are used in the construction of weaponry, but cutbacks in the armed forces and conversion of part of the armament industries to civilian use have reduced the amount of bullion needed, according to the government newspaper. Giving an example of the use of precious metals in the defence industry, the paper said that construction of a MiG-23 jet fighter required 512 grams of gold, 69 grams of platinum and 17 kilograms of silver.

The defence ministry has handed over all its precious metal reserves to the treasury, the paper said.

The Soviet Union's external debt has recently risen dramatically, and foreign experts believe Moscow has increased its sales of precious metals abroad.

Scientific

Development of 'Mir' Complex Detailed

LD1706142190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0504 GMT on 16 June broadcasts a 10-minute program entitled "Man, Earth, Universe," presented by Cosmonaut Vitaliy Ivanovich Sevastyanov.

Sevastyanov begins the program by describing the progressive development and expansion of the Mir orbital station. Video footage is shown of the launch of the Kristall module, showing the carrier rocket, with six strap-on stage one boosters, topped by a black cylindrical payload fairing with a conical nose. According to Sevastyanov, the Kristall module, "also known as a technology module," is intended for "further experiments and research in the sphere of space technology, and also for the industrial manufacture of some crystals, alloys, and materials which will find extensive use in various sectors of the national economy, first of all in electronics, radio engineering, and in pharmacology."

Next, Sevastyanov recalls the philosophy of the modular construction of the Mir station, which allows for its gradual expansion with dedicated modules. This is illustrated with shots of men assembling the station, unfolding the solar panels and by handling a model of Mir showing the multi-port docking unit and Mir's interior. Subsequent computer graphics show how various modules can dock with the station. "But, they need not do it all at once. The modules can dock, the cosmonauts can set the equipment and launch them into free flight, while the station with its crew becomes an orbital control centre," Sevastyanov adds. The graphics show a possible configuration for a modular telescope platform and an industrial module. This is followed by archive shots of Poland's Miroslav Hermaszewski and presumably Petr Klimuk experimenting presumably aboard Salyut-6.

In the next sequence V.D. Blagov, USSR state prize winner and deputy flight controller, uses a wall chart to explain the present configuration of the space station. The chart shows a Progress cargo craft, the Kvant module, the Mir unit, and a Soyuz craft all docked in a line, with Kvant-2 and Kristall docked laterally onto Mir. According to Blagov, "Kristall approached the axial port of the Mir station, just like the previous module, Kvant-2. Next, using a manipulator, it was moved to a lateral docking node."

This is followed by shots of what is presumably the Kristall module inside a plant and close-ups of two rack-mounted furnaces, both cylindrical, some two feet in diameter. Brief footage is shown of an installation marked "Optizon," showing a cylinder, hinged open from a hexagonal flange, both seemingly containing yellow parabolic reflectors, cutting to a close-up of a rectangular control panel with a number of keys and switches. Blagov explains: "The Kristall module delivered technical equipment for us, consisting of four furnaces—Optizon, Krater, Zona-02 and Zona-03. All four furnaces are intended for the manufacture of crystals in conditions of weightlessness. In particular, the Krater furnace uses resistance heating and is for fairly large crystals; crystals of approxiamtely 50 mm diameter can be grown in that furnace. The Optizon furnace works on a different principle—the principle of rapid heating by concentrating light rays on the sample. The Zona-02 and Zona-03 furnaces are also of resistance-heating type and they grow crystals in various media—in argon, for instance—and in other media.

"One might ask why the module delivered four furnaces? Wouldn't one or two have been enough? We would like to organize semi-industrial production of the maximum possible amounts of these crystals. In connection with this, four furnaces were ordered, and the program envisages simultaneous working of two or three furnaces which can be provided with electric power supplied from the solar batteries of our orbital power plant. High temperatures in the furnaces are achieved through using electric power to heat up the samples, some some of the furnaces by using resistance heating, while in the Optizon furnace by using radiation from special lamps." Video shows a hinged-open cylindrical door, revealing a vertical pipe, a panning shot of a module inside a plant, zooming in on what appears to be a cluster of side-thruster nozzles, and previous shots of the Zona furnaces.

Blagov goes on: "We expect that during the duration of the sixth expedition's flight aboard the station, the complex of equipment delivered by the Kristall module will enable us to achieve a significant economic effect amounting to a figure of more than R3 million from the technology installations alone. We also estimate that geophysical research using the equipment delivered by this module will also produce an economic effect of approximately the same order of magnitude.

"Crystals and semiconductors produced by the furnaces can be used in various branches of the electronics industry. In particular, they can be used as components in electronic equipment. Since they have greater purity, obviously the quality of this equipment is going to be higher than of that manufactured on the basis of crystals produced in terrestrial conditions. Second, we think that in particular we shall be able to use gallium arsenide for producing electric power, using solar batteries which we use extensively in our space technology. The amounts produced on the Kristall module will probably be sufficient at the first stage to install an experimental panel on the solar batteries in order to compare the quality and output of its electric power with those of the traditional panels we use today. We are hoping that its efficiency will be higher, and then we shall face the practical question of manufacturing the required quantity of such components for our own use, for the further development of space exploration, and for obtaining electric power from, say, solar pannels of a smaller surface area."

Blagov shows a monochrome picture of the Mir complex as described, but with four laterally docked modules. "A couple of words about how the Mir station is going to develop in the future," Blagov says. "I have here a photograph of the final configuration of the Mir station, which has five modules at its docking ports. You can see here in this diagram four modules docked at the front lateral ports and one module, Kvant, which we have mentioned already. Apart from the technology module Kristall, the Spektr module will also be docked with the station, which will have optical and spectrometry equipment for expanding research for long-distance probing of the earth. There will also be the Priroda [nature] module, which will carry equipment for ecological research of the planet earth. This is a very interesting complex of equipment, and we invite scientists from all countries to take part in fitting out the ecological module, so that consequently we can carry out joint research using this module."

Cosmonauts Queried on Space Program

LD1806083190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0505 GMT on 16 June broadcasts the one-hour "Man, Earth, Universe" program, which includes a communications session between presenter Vitaliy Sevastyanov and (Nikolay Pavlovich Tarasenko), head of a department at the EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN weekly. Throughout the item, the video cuts from shots of these two, along with other personnel at the Flight Control Center, and poor-quality pictures of cosmonauts Aleksandr Balandin and Anatoliy Solovyev aboard the Mir complex.

Tarasenko explains that Anatoliy Solovyev was appointed the magazines special correspondent in space, and that the editors have prepared a selection of most representative questions they get in the reader's mail for the cosmonauts to answer.

Among questions read by Tarasenko there is one from a Belgorod reader: "Last year expenditure on military space exploration came to R3.9 billion. Is it not proposed to reallocate some of these resources to civilian space exploration?"

Balandin replies: "Well, as far as military space exploration is concerned, our countries—those with the powerful weapons, I think—are just making the first steps in the treaties and accords on disarmament, on arms limitations. That is why these national means of verification, seeing as we do not have any arms in space...."

Solovyev interupts: "This is banned by treaties."

Balandin resumes: "That is right; it is banned. So here, you know, trust but verify. If we are now spending resources on the ground, for verification on the ground—well, we all know that our specialists go and work in the United States, and U.S. specialists work here, attend experiments, carry out verifications—then we should approach this cautiously and carefully."

Solovyev adds: "Today, however, the dynamics of our life are such that we could say that today it is too early to cut back these appropriations, but the dynamics are such that neither can we be late in this direction, I mean cut-backs, because that would mean unnecessary outlays that also are needed for other directions of the national economy."

In response to the questions whether space or aerial monitoring of crop areas is going to result in more expensive bread prices, Solovyev says that "space monitoring of arable land cannot be replaced with any terrestrial means. Similarly, in cartographic verification, five minutes of photography from aboard the space complex is equivalent to a year's work by a Tu-134 (?RKh) plane, which we currently have in our country and which works in this field, but neither can one say here that this should be done only from space and that is it. We still do not have enough means of monitoring; cloud cover frequently gets in the way. That is, we have to approach this in a coordinated way, integrated way. We should have this system, with its equipment which we already have on board, and there should be planes that perhaps, in particular areas, can cope with this task better."

A reader asks about the cost of one space photograph, for instance, of the area of Moscow. After clarifying what kind of photograph is in question, the cosmonauts estimate that with processing costs it would probably come to something like $300 to 400. Solovyev adds that "photographs that will be sent from aboard the Mir station now are competitive," and "as far as resolution and detail is concerned, they surpass foreign photographs." "Unfortunately, however, there is another side that we probably do not have that well organized. We often come onto the market with our potential too late. We have fine equipment here; we have products, but we come onto the market when there is already another competitor there. He came a bit earlier and we came a bit later. Our products are better, but he has signed the contracts already."

Sevastyanov adds that the U.S. side is on the market with photographs selling at $5 to $18, but a Moscow calendar illustrated with space photographs of the city is selling at R3, and that "we could be offering such pictures at, say, a fiver, and of no worse quality, but for some reason we are not doing so." Solovyev interrupts to say that their pictures are of better quality.

A Sverdlovsk area reader asks for details of that fledgelings that were born in the space incubator. Solovyev explains that this is one aspect of "solving the global task of sustaining human life through a closed cycle. One aspect is the provision of water, which I have to say we are solving quite successfully. We drink water. Literally half-an-hour or an hour ago we had a run, we perspire, we breath fast, all this generates moisture. And we have a system which collects this moisture and we have an installation that serves us this moisture in the form of completely pure, fine, preserved water, supplemented with all the necessary salts. That is a closed cycle.

"Another aspect of the same issue is the provision of food for the cosmonauts, and it has been decided that quail chicks are the most promising thing in this respect. Now, for instance, the freighters bring us up quail pate. That means cans. And here, in this cycle, when the quails here are going to produce eggs for us, this is going to mean obvious savings. They will not have to carry all this iron up here, all these cans. That is why this experiment has been set up and will be continued." Solovyev appears to demonstrate a tiny chick, which he extracts from somewhere along the side of the station.

In conclusion, to a reader's question about how much a man-hour in space costs, Solovyev says one hour spent by a spaceman in orbit costs "of the order of R50,000." That includes the running costs of the space complex, and ground installations and controllers and so on. He also says that so far they have been running at a loss. Sevastyanov adds from earth that the shortfall was small, "only two percent by the results of 1989." According to Solovyev, once new biotechnology and technology experiments are set up and when they start working two new modules, they are going to start making profits.

Technological Testing Continues on 'Mir'

LD1506123190 Moscow TASS in English 1114 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Cosmonauts Anatoliy Solovyov and Aleksandr Balandin will check the functioning of a new technological unit, Krater-V, today. After the first test—designed to last 15 hours—the unit will be used to produce semiconductor materials with improved structural and electrophysical properties in zero gravity.

In the afternoon, the cosmonauts working on board the orbital space station Mir will prepare a Soviet-Bulgarian greenhouse house, Svet. The greenhouse will be used for experiments involving the cultivation of higher plants in orbit. Lettuce and radishes were selected.

Under the flight schedule, the crew were busy this week connecting onboard systems and equipment on the Kristall module to the manned complex.

The cosmonauts also started adjusting the research equipment on board Kristall for scheduled studies and experiments.

Solovyov and Balandin tested the high-resolution photographic complex Priroda-5, designed to photograph the surface of earth in the interest of various branches of science and economy.

The Soviet crew have been working in orbit for 125 days. The flight is proceeding according to schedule. The cosmonauts are healthy and feeling fine.

New Scientific-Industrial Union Holds Congress

LD1606200290 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The constituent congress of the Scientific-Industrial Union of the USSR was held here today. The message of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev to the participants in the congress was read out by member of the USSR Presidential Council Yevgeniy Primakov.

The idea of creating such a union was advanced by the scientific-industrial group of USSR people's deputies. New relations in production are in the offing and millions of people start to develop new attitudes to the economy. People's deputies believe these complex tasks cannot be resolved by reliance on traditional structures and organizational forms.

The proposal to create a fundamentally new self-governing public organisation, the scientific-industrial union of the USSR, met with broad approval of scientists and the technological intelligentsia in the USSR.

The union's draft regulations say that its chief task is to protect the rights and promote the interests of national industry and develop science in conditions of various forms of property and development of market relations.

Industrial, scientific, financial and other enterprises and organisations can be collective members. Heads of work collectives, scientists, entrepreneurs and specialists can be individual members.

The new public organization will conduct wide-ranging activity. Among its priority tasks will be enhancing social status and prestige of enterprise in the USSR, rendering all-round assistance to work collectives to ensure a more effective use of their scientific and technical potential, vigorous support for medium and small enterprises, assistance to international economic cooperation of enterprises and setting up of joint ventures.

Military

General Lobov on German Armies' Dissolution

LD1506140190 Hamburg DPA in German 1338 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Soviet Army General Vladimir Lobov, chief of staff of the Warsaw Pact Supreme Command, has proposed the dissolution of the Bundeswehr and the National People's Army. In an interview for BILD, the Saturday edition, Lobov said that this is the best security guarantee for the Soviet Union. A territorial army is sufficient. This will also make the path to German unity easier. The variant whereby the National People's Army joins the Bundeswehr and comes under NATO is unacceptable. This will badly damage the balance of forces in Europe. The chapter of World War II must finally be closed in the form of a peace treaty or other agreement.

Frolov Chairs Discussion on Military Reform

PM1706175190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "The Army and Perestroyka"]

[Text] Participants in yesterday's meeting at the PRAVDA editorial office engaged in a frank and sharp debate on the need for profound military reform in the USSR Armed Forces, the role of Army and Navy political organs in the new conditions, and the social protection of servicemen and members of their families.

On the eve of the 28th party congress, opinions on the sort of army the country needs were expressed by Army Generals I. Matveyev, N. Grebenkin, V. Marchenkov, V. Bespalov, K. Maslov, and Yu. Rodionov; Colonels N. Karasev, V. Burov, N. Ryazanov, A. Kuznetsov, and E. Vorontsov; Lieutenant Colonel N. ILkin; Majors A. Zakharov and S. Pivovarov; Colonel, Retired, V. Yevdokimov; V. Koshelev, official from the All-Union Central Council of Trade Unions; and A. Gorokhov, PRAVDA Military Desk editor.

The meeting was chaired by by I. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA.

A detailed account will be published in one of the newspaper's next few issues.

Yazov Speaks to Soviet Military Writers

LD1506154290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0515 GMT 14 Jun 90

["...With Your Name, Homeland" program featuring recorded portions of "recent" meeting between Dmitriy Yazov, USSR minister of defense and member of the Presidential Council, and Soviet writers, at the Grekov military-artistic studio]

[Excerpts] [First announcer] Esteemed comrades, we have prepared for you a literary and topical affairs program entitled "...With Your Name, Homeland." We are airing this program today in connection with two dates that are unforgettable for our countrymen: the recently celebrated 45th anniversary of the Great Victory, and also the anniversary of the start of the Great Fatherland War, which we mark in a week's time.

[Second announcer] The subject of today's program will be the sacred feeling which we cannot do without either now or in the future: a feeling that engendered courage, heroism, and military and labour valor, and made it possible to rout fascist Germany—the feeling of love for our fatherland. The program will also deal with the way in which this love for the homeland and the readiness to do everything possible for it can be nurtured in Soviet people during the difficult time in which we live. All this was dealt with at a recent meeting between Marshal of the Soviet Union Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov, USSR minister of defense and member of the Presidential Council, and a group of well-known Soviet writers who are veterans of the front. The meeting took place at the "Grekov" military-artistic studio. Opening the meeting, Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov said:

[Begin recording] [Yazov] Many know about the war and much is known about the war, and if people do know about the war, it seems to me this is through your work, through your novels, stories, tales, poems and verses. [passage omitted]

Almost every day now, you can read in any paper of the need for military reform. Experts in military affairs and people's deputies—Major Lopatin and several other captains—are attempting to bring about this military reform and are calling for it to be conducted as quickly as possible. I talked to them. I asked what they meant by military reform. The Army should be small, but mobile and very strong. They said: A fine grasp of philosophy these people have! We have always said that quantitative changes lead to qualitative changes—but here they're going to have quality without quantity! How are they gong to achieve it? You can make a single tank that is the most up-to-date tank there is, which can travel on land, fly, and anything else you care to mention. But it won't win on its own. In the Army, you need quantity. You can't get by without it. Of course we back reductions of the Army. But we don't want to reduce it in such a way that people are thrown overboard. Today we are withdrawing troops from Czechoslovakia. We are withdrawing them from Hungary. They have to be withdrawn and put somewhere. Take the personnel—make an announcement, and they'll all go back to their home today. You don't need to be too bright to work that out! But there are regular officers. One has to sort it out somehow. The Warsaw Pact is on the brink of collapse. The GDR has appointed a minister of disarmament and defense! I'm quite serious! Does the Ministry of Disarmament itself intend that the ministry will be part of the Warsaw Pact? And if so, will it just be a fiction? You will have heard that the Procurator's Office announced that the CPCz was illegal, and so on.

There you have pluralism! There you have alternatives! Take the Lithuanians, who at the first congress and then at the sessions talked more than anyone else about pluralism, and about some sort of special standards of behavior for deputies, and so on, and who themselves now reached a point where they are ready to prohibit everything.

You will have noticed how rapidly the politicization of our society and of the world is proceeding today. All this politicization is based on one assumption—that supposedly now there won't be a war—and since there won't be a war, there is no need for an army. Since there is no need for an army, why have this military-patriotic education?

The Americans have not destroyed anything, and they won't destroy anything. They have not reduced anything, and they won't reduce anything. I can tell you something else—Cheney has toured a large number of Asian and

Latin American countries. He persuaded the Japanese, for instance, to spend $2.5 billion on the upkeep of U.S. troops in Okinawa. He went to South Korea, where he persuaded South Korea to spend $1.5 to $2 billion on the maintenance of the 25th Division and the 8th Army headquarters. There is a force of 41,000 in South Korea altogether. The money they spend does not go into the budget the United States declares.

West Germany also contributes a proportion of the money used for maintaining the U.S. Army—up to 30 percent. At any rate, all the flats occupied by servicemen are paid for out of the FRG budget. There are other channels along which the West Germans finance the upkeep of the troops stationed on their territory.

But no one gives us anything. It all comes out of our own pockets. I've mentioned this several times, and I'd like to repeat it again. There's a book by Vladimir Vasilyevich Karpov called Eternal Battle. The education of officers in the officers' milieu, and the education of collectives in the collective and through the collective are an eternal battle. It seems to me that we can reject what we like, but if today we don't do the necessary work with the people and among the people, tomorrow who will do the work? Education was and remains an eternal battle. In this battle, the role of first fiddle has been played and will continue to be played by writers.

I find it a little awkward to repeat the phrase: engineers of human souls. After all, yesterday's phrase is no longer noteworthy today. If we don't call writers engineers, what are we to call them? Designers or builders of the human soul? Well, some of them would agree to be called technicians! I think writers who are veterans of the front deserve particular respect. In our Army, the word writer always has been and continues to be valued.

Literate people are joining the Army now. Sometimes we don't take account of this. When I went to the Volkhov front as a platoon commander, we had 40 men in the platoon. One of them came over into the dugout in the evening. He said: Will you write a letter for me? A lot of them were illiterate. I said: Dictate it, and I'll write it down. He said: In the first lines of my letter, I convey my greetings.... And he conveyed his greetings to the whole village, listing everyone. At the end, he said he was alive and well.

[Unidentified writer] That's what I wish for you, too.

[Yazov] Yes. Isn't it true what I've just said? [assenting voices] That is how it was. But now soldiers come to us with 10 forms in school behind them. It's of course a different time and a different generation now, compared with the war. You will remember that in his orders Stalin would repeat on numerous occasions: Soldiers must learn to use a rifle. Have you noticed this in the orders of the end of 1941 and early in 1942?

Today, a soldier can learn to use an automatic rifle in literally a few hours. He has a knowledge of physics and chemistry. He has an idea of the connections between parts and mechanisms, you know. Almost everyone who comes into the Army today can drive a vehicle. To drive a vehicle, after all, you have to know what the connections are between the parts and mechanisms. Compared with a vehicle, an automatic rifle is just a toy for him.

On the one hand, the Army has become, if not much more cultured, then at least more literate. I do not link culture and literacy. I don't think they are the same things. In the Army, the equipment has become more complex and powerful by three or four orders of magnitude. We now have the fourth generation of jet aircraft, and the correlation between the Su-27 and the MiG-15, for instance, is 1:12. Two Su-27s replace a whole regiment of MiG-15s in capacity, and two Su-27s are much more powerful than two regiments from the Great Patriotic War period.

Well, naturally, such a colossal difference in capacity creates a certain tension in people, especially pilots, when they are operating these aircraft. Having taken his seat in the cockpit, and a pilot can photograph himself—in critical situations, so to speak—none of these pilots recognize themselves, their faces are so distorted and their body weight, so to speak, changes so much during—well, maybe the weight, as such, doesn't change. But all these loops and so on. [sentence as heard]

[Unidentified writer] [passage indistinct]

[Yazov] Yes, they have an effect. Again I've wandered away from literature. I'm that keen to get you to write more good things about the Army.

Or take the Navy. We are building large ships these days. There are cruisers that carry aircraft. Our first big warship of this kind is, of course, smaller than the American equivalent. Its displacement is about 79,000 tons, whereas the American vessels each displace 100,000 tons. Their ships have decks 400 meters long. The Americans now have virtually done away with steam catapults. They don't use catapults. Their aircraft are able to take off unassisted—and not just their VTOL [vertical take off and landing] aircraft, either. They have aircraft which easily can get airborne within 400 meters. Some of them even can do it in 150 meters. We visited an American aircraft carrier. It was in France. I went aboard the Clemenceau. But, even compared with our vessel, the Clemenceau seems as though it belongs to the last century. It displaces 33,000 tons and has steam turbines, providing about 160,000 hp. Well, that is quite powerful. Well, the French also fly—and quite well, too. Evidently, the French will be visiting us at Sevastopol soon. Our warships will visit Lyons [as heard]. Contacts have to be maintained in some form, like that.

Last year the British visited us at Leningrad. Our sailors visited Britain. I think these ties facilitate to a certain extent the strengthening of peace and mutual understanding. But nowhere do we find they are prepared to disarm. They only are prepared to disarm us. In fact, they say so quite unashamedly.

My view of this is as follows. Do we have to cut back on something or not? Of course, we have to cut back, and we can do so without sacrificing combat readiness. The war taught us such an instructive lesson that, like the Plyushkins, we began keeping everything. We keep tanks which date back to the Great Patriotic War.

When we were in the United States, they showed us around—and conscientiously, too. They even went about it with special aplomb, I would say—as though to say: Look, we'll show you Kizma's mother here. [idiomatic expression meaning: We'll teach you a lesson] Incidentally, the Americans translate the words Kuzma's mother as the mother of Kuzma. [laughter]. We visited the 82d Airborne Division, the division which was landed during the Normandy operation. It also took part in the assault on Grenada. It's the same division which was recently landed in [incomplete sentence as heard] In other words, its their best, their elite division. It is based at Fort Bragg.

I wanted to talk about this for two reasons: first, to illustrate their attachment to tradition and, second, to tell you about how they land an assault force. One evening, we were invited to a dinner. They invited the public. They threw up some kind of camp. Horses were grazing there. There were pumpkins and melons scattered around. The cooks laid on food.

The evening, translated into Russian, was called: chewing over a sucking pig's bones. [laughter] Well, they were masters at that. In between they arranged a kind of circus during which a performance was put on by soldiers of the 82d Airborne Division. First of all, they sang the division's anthem. As soon as they began to sing it, the old men and women who were there rose to their feet, as if they had been called to attention, and remained standing until the anthem had been sung right through, from beginning to end. They reacted this way to the division's anthem—and here, when the Soviet national anthem is played, some remain seated.

[Unidentified writer] That did not happen before.

[Yazov] Then one morning we were put on a plane. The commander of the 18th Airborne Corps, to which this division belongs, was there. The division commander and a brigade commander were there. They flew on the same plane. Well, the corps commander wanted to demonstrate to us he would be the first to jump. Well, indeed, he was the first. He was then followed by the divisional commander. There were 40 or 50 men on that plane, and they all jumped. Well, we turned around and landed. Then the corps commander transferred to another plane. I am going to make another jump, he said. One American told me the commander gets $130 for each jump he does. [laughter] Therefore, on prestigious occasions like this, when someone is present, he tries to make as many jumps as possible. Well, they jumped, landed, lay down, and kept on lying there.

Well, then they began dropping equipment. They had decided to show off. Well, the lower you drop equipment, the greater the effect you hope to achieve. The first tank was smashed to pieces. The tracks, wheels, turret—everything was thrown all over the place. That was from a height of 250 meters. The parachutes did not inflate. The second tank was dropped. That also was smashed to smithereens. Then the command was given to go up higher. The plane circled round. They went up another 400 to 800 meters then began dropping equipment again. They showed us the division's entire range of equipment, literally, in action. We saw them shooting, driving.

That was not all. We wanted to leave. No, they said, we want you to come this way. We do so. Someone comes out and meets me. I am detachment commander (Khoreshchuk), he says. [laughter] How did you get here? I asked. [laughter] Well, it turned out that he was born in the United States, but his parents had been taken to West Germany by force, and subsequently...[changes thought] The second was a Pole. There also was a Cuban, a Bulgarian, a Hungarian, a Czech, and a German. This 82d Airborne Division is training sabotage squads made up of various nationalities: Russians, Ukrainian, Poles, and Hungarians. So here we are sitting around, talking about peace, saying that nobody is preparing any longer for...[changes thought] They are preparing for everything.

Is a professional army a good or bad idea? We visited the Pacific seaboard at San Diego. That is where the First Marine Division is based. It is part of the Rapid Deployment Force. We went aboard a warship. It was a conventional assault ship. It had a deck. Aircraft and helicopters can use it. We took a ride in a helicopter and they showed us this assault ship. It accommodates 2,500 men. It can carry all the equipment needed by these 2,500 men. What is more, it has room for another four air-cushioned landing vessels in its hold. We, the members of our delegation, landed as the first wave of the assault, and from there began watching the landing. Either they were simply fooling us, or they really were badly trained. After landing, they made for the bushes and lay there. Airborne troops were set down 220 meters further on. They also lay down where they landed. I went up to them and said: "Why are you not attacking? Marines are coming ashore there. We have not been ordered to, sir, came the reply. I ask the others the same question, but I get the same reply: We have not been ordered to, sir.

I think the explanation was quite simple. He is paid to do a job. He gets $2,500 a month. How old are you? I ask. I am 35, he says. Well, who wants to run at the age of 35 to 40? I have the impression the U.S. professional Army is a luxury allowed them by their economic power. The U.S. conducts large-scale mobilization operations and does not envisage having just this professional Army in wartime. The United States has all the means to bring its military industry to full capacity, to mobilize the Army. The French have roughly the same policy, but the French are not at all going over to a professional army. The West Germans are not going over to a professional army, either.

Although the British have gone over to a professional army, to a certain extent, they too envisage carrying out mobilization operations. [end recording]

[Announcer] Then Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov answered questions from participants in the meeting.

[Begin recording] [Writer Mikhail Alekseyev] [passage omitted] Dmitriy Timofeyevich, don't you think that we—I say we because I am a retired colonel—are too timid when we hear our Army being slandered, when we see these attacks on what some regard as the last bastion preventing a dark deed from reaching its logical conclusion? The Army expects assistance from us, but we also expect assistance from the Army.

[Yazov] Thank you. You have raised a subject I have already spoken about. But apparently I did not make the most important point. You know, we arranged a meeting between force commanders and a member of the Politburo. What emerged was roughly as follows: We have now proclaimed pluralism, freedom of expression, and so on and so forth. Are we now, once again, going to close everything up?

Your indignation must merge with ours. There are certain things against which it is not all that easy to fight. Well, you're quite right. The Army has nothing to do with this. Well, some people are associating, one way or the other, literally everything that happened with the actions of the Armed Forces, with the Army. They see the Army as the embodiment of this.

But we shouldn't be surprised about this. The worst attacks immediately after the war were on our victory, on our history. Our soldiers had not managed to travel back to their home areas before the attacks started.

[Writer Nikolay Gribachev] [passage omitted] My question is this: Does the Army have its own press, does it have its own publishing house to rely on, or not?

[Yazov] Only here in Moscow. There is the Military Publishing House [Voenizdat] which prints books and then there is a second publishing house, the Krasnaya Zvezda Publishing House. There are also publishing houses in the individual military regions. So, we could be doing more in this area. [passage omitted] [end recording]

[Announcer] At the end of this friendly discussion with writers who fought on the front, Dmitriy Timofeyevich Yazov said:

[Begin Yazov recording] Permit me to wish you all the best on the holiday, good health, and many, many years of life for the happiness and prosperity of our Soviet people and our entire society. [applause] [end Yazov recording]

Unilateral Troops Cuts Pledges Being Fulfilled

PM1506174590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "Unilateral Pledges Being Fulfilled"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is consistently implementing its unilateral decision to cut back its Armed Forces. Their numbers have been cut by 296,600 servicemen to date. The 13th Guards Division, which has been withdrawn from Hungarian territory, and the 32d Guards and 25th Tank Divisions, which have been withdrawn from GDR territory, have been disbanded. In addition a number of assault-landing and assault-crossing units and subunits have been withdrawn from the groups of troops, along with their regulation arms and equipment.

Accords have been secured in the course of bilateral Soviet-Czechoslovak and Soviet-Hungarian talks on the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops from the territory of the CSFR [Czech and Slovak Federal Republic] and Hungary. Seven divisions will be withdrawn in 1991, including three tank divisions.

At the same time it must be borne in mind that a new military-strategic situation has developed in Europe since the Soviet statement regarding its unilateral withdrawal of six tank divisions from the GDR, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary and their subsequent disbandment. However, despite this, the Soviet Union, acting in the spirit of M.S. Gorbachev's 7 December 1988 speech at the United Nations, has disbanded another three tank divisions in the European part of the USSR.

Thus, as envisaged, six tank divisions have been withdrawn from the strength of the Ground Forces and disbanded.

On agreement with the Mongolian Government, Soviet troops temporarily stationed there will also return home.

Chernavin Cited on N-Sub Dismantling Protest

PM1806084190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Own correspondent B. Reznik report followed by commentary by Fleet Admiral V. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy, under the "Details For IZVESTIYA" rubric: "Secrets of the Declassified Submarines"]

[Text] Khabarovsk—The public is protesting against any kind of work being carried out on the nuclear reactors of submarines moored in Sovetskaya Gavan Bay.

The reason for the protests were rumors to the effect that radioactive components containing nuclear fuel will be removed on the spot from nuclear submarines moored in Postovaya Bay which have outlived their useful lives. This seriously alarmed the local inhabitants. And the fact that the rumors were not groundless was confirmed by the Vanino Rayon newspaper VOSKHOD in its very emotional article "There Will Be No One To Laugh."

Only a day later in the same newspaper A. Klimov, chairman of the Vaninskiy Rayon soviet, called the journalist's article "fabrications," and assured us that "no work has been carried out on the boats and no work is planned." The rayon newspaper workers were then heavily criticized at a recent Vaninskiy Raykom [Rayon Party Committee] plenum. Yu. Savakin, political worker at the Sovetskaya Gavan Naval Garrison, spoke from the rostrum there. "Work involving the removal of components or reactors has not only not been carried out," he said, "but is technically impossible here."

Such assurances from authoritative leaders should cool passions but, strange as it may seem, after this they broke out with renewed force. Inhabitants of Vanino and Sovetskaya Gavan gathered at sanctioned and unsanctioned rallies, demanded that the military and civil authorities tell them the truth, organized continuous pickets in the naval base area, and delegated their representatives to examine the moored nuclear submarines and measure the background radiation level....

The submarines were empty, there was no work being carried out on them, and the background radiation, as the instruments showed, corresponded to the norm. The next reassuring news came from L. Ivanyute, chairman of the city soviet, in the columns of the Sovetskaya Gavan newspaper SOVETSKAYA ZVEZDA. He told the inhabitants that the night before he had spoken on the telephone to G. Khvatov, commander of the Pacific Fleet, who confirmed that there were no instructions to dismantle the units.

So, was this unfounded alarm? Time has shown that it was not unfounded. Only 10 days later, at a joint extraordinary session of the two soviets, V. Kuroyedov, commander of the Sovetskaya Gavan Naval Garrison, was forced to admit under pressure from the public that there were plans to remove nuclear fuel from the submarine reactors, there were intensive preparations for this, and it was being done on the instructions of... Admiral Khvatov. "I am now convinced that thanks to you I will receive different instructions—not to carry out the work," Kuroyedov continued.

The premonition of the admiral from Sovetskaya Gavan did not deceive him. Even before the end of the session's work he received a telegram from the fleet commander saying that the ill-fated instructions were rescinded, and he reported this to the deputies straight away. The naval department's deception and its attempt to carry out dangerous work on the quiet in a place that was not suited for it, was revealed.

The public won, but the problem remains. Many old nuclear vessels are being taken out of service—partly within the disarmament program—and the question of where to put them and where to dismantle and strip them is an acute one. This is hardly the place for advice to the naval command. But one thing is clear: These questions can only be resolved openly and without cutting corners on what may turn out to be an irreversible calamity for the people.

Commentary by Fleet Admiral V. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy:

"The final decision on removing the radioactive components from reactors in nuclear submarines in Postovaya Bay has still not been made. The Pacific Fleet command needs around a month to work out all the possible options for this operation. For my part, I can only say that we have 30 years' experience here.

"The technique for this work is well organized and the Navy has the necessary resources and reliably trained personnel at its disposal to recharge the reactors. As a rule, such operations are carried out in the water at ship repair enterprises, which are located near populated areas, and also at places where nuclear submarines are stationed, using specially constructed nuclear tenders for this purpose.

"Safety is strictly observed here. I mean, during the process of removing radioactive components the background radiation in the area of the operation does not exceed permissible norms, and the submarine itself and the components that are taken out are completely safe as far as radiation is concerned.

"The removed components are taken to the nuclear tender and handed over to be used by industry.

"It was never planned that nuclear submarine units would be dismantled in Postovaya, and Admiral G. Khvatov told City Soviet Chairman L. Ivanyute so. I believe that the misunderstandings that arose in the village are the result of not providing the people with information and poor explanatory work on the part of the organs of people's power as well as the fleet and naval base command.

"We are prepared for open dialogue with the population. Thus, for example, at the request of the inhabitants of the Kola Peninsula and Arkhangelsk Oblast, an expert commission involving USSR people's deputies and representatives of several scientific institutes visited Northern Fleet bases in 1990. Moreover, these were institutes that are independent of the Navy. A comprehensive investigation showed that we have committed no violations.

"And there will be no violations in Postovaya Bay. We are inviting representatives of the city's public to our operations. They will be able to see for themselves that all safety measures are being observed. And it could not happen any other way—after all, naval seamen live in Sovetskaya Gavan. People who work on nuclear submarines and serve on them. Their wives and children. We are not our own enemies.

"And last. Moving submarines that have outlived their working life will demand further expenditure from us to the tune of R600,000 to 800,000. And that is the cost of the housing which we all lack today."

Baltic Republics

Baltic Assembly on Security, Independence Issues

LD1606233490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2103 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] [Presenter Igor Rostovtsev] The Baltic Assembly opened today in Jurmala, Latvia. As we have seen, in recent months the integration and narrowing of the positions of the Baltic republics has been accelerating.

[A. Wilmar] The second Baltic Assembly was held in Jurmala today. Taking part in it were representatives of the Lithuanian Sajudis, and of the Popular Fronts of Latvia and Estonia. The first assembly of the Baltic popular movements was held last year in Tallinn, just 10 days before the opening of the First Congress of USSR People's Deputies. It was at the assembly that the deputies from the Baltic republics who represented the popular fronts created a unified bloc and drew up a joint program of action for the congress. Thus the first parliamentary faction was created. An appeal to the democratic forces of the Soviet Union was also adopted in Tallinn.

In Jurmala today the second Baltic Assembly examined three issues. The first was the place of the popular movements in the sociopolitical processes going on in the republics: the second was the Baltic process and the democratic movement in the Soviet Union; and the third concerned the struggle by Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia for state independence within the context of European security.

The reports on these topics lasted six hours. Then the assembly participants held a demonstration on the seashore in which the societies for national culture—which unite those Russians, Poles, Jews, Tatars, and Germans who live in Latvia—took part. In all, there are 17 such societies.

As in Tallinn, representatives of the Popular Fronts of Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Armenia, and Georgia took part in the work of the Baltic Assembly in Jurmala. Many observers compare the Baltic Assembly with the Europarliament.

[Rostovtsev] That was report by Latvian Television. [video shows scenes from the assembly; demonstration on sea shore]

Independence Freeze Opposed

OW1706044190 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 0300 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Text] According To a KYODO report from Moscow, the People's Front organizations of three Baltic nations, including Lithuania, held a conference of Baltic nations at Jurmala in the Latvian republic, and adopted an appeal opposing any action to freeze the declaration of independence. The appeal said that no one has the authority to retract bills or decisions on the independence declaration or to demand the freezing of this declaration.

The Lithuanian government is due to introduce as early as 18 or 19 June a proposal to the Supreme Soviet to temporarily freeze the republic's independence declaration. The Supreme Soviet is equivalent to the parliament. But since Sajudis, the Lithuanian People's Front organization, holds two-thirds of the seats in the parliament, it is certain that the government proposal will evoke a strong reaction from the parliament.

A rough road is expected before the Soviet central government and Lithuania will be able to begin negotiations on the question of independence.

Warns Against 'Retreat'

LD1606205990 Moscow TASS in English 1952 GMT 16 Jun 90

["Second Baltic Assembly held in Riga"—TASS headline; by TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga June 16 TASS—Representatives of the Latvian, Lithuanian and Estonian popular movements today declared in the address to parliaments of the three Baltic republics that "nobody has a right to demand either abrogation or halting the acts on independence. A retreat will harm the democratic movement."

Delegations of the Estonian and Latvian Popular Fronts and of the Lithuanian movement Sajudis today held in the Latvian resort of Jurmala the second meeting of the Baltic Assembly.

The participants in the meeting discussed the role of the popular movements in conditions when representatives of the popular fronts earned majority in parliaments and local councils.

President of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Vytautas Landsbergis in his speech at the assembly emphasised the need to combine efforts. "We should tightly clasp hands so that the hold should not be broken and that the Baltic link remain intact," he said.

The participants in the assembly adopted documents condemning the USSR's economic sanctions against Lithuania and called for the widening of interethnic contacts, particularly with the republics of the USSR.

A news conference held upon the conclusion of the Baltic Assembly was told that the proposal of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev that the adopted acts be frozen for the duration of the negotiations be discussed in parliaments of the three republics next week. Then the opinions of deputies will be coordinated by the Baltic Council, which consists of Latvian, Lithuanian, and Estonian leaders, to adopt a united stand.

Landsbergis Addresses Assembly

LD1706201990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Russian 1920 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Text] The Second Baltic Assembly has ended in Jurmala, a Latvian sea resort. Delegations from the People's Fronts of Estonia and Latvia, and of the Lithuanian Sajudis took part in it.

Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania, spoke at the assembly, placing a special emphasis on the necessity of rallying the efforts so that, as he put it, the Baltic link is not broken.

In the concluding documents, the economic sanctions imposed on Lithuania by the USSR were renounced by the assembly delegates.

The participants in the assembly pointed out that no one had the right either to rescind or suspend the act of independence."

Lithuanian Communique on Independence 'Moratorium'

LD1606174790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Now we return to internal matters, events, and problems. We have just received a TASS report from Vilnius. An important decision which might provide a start to resolving all the so-called Lithuanian problems was adopted today at a meeting of the republic's Council of Ministers.

A communique made public by the republic's government information service says, and I quote: "The government suggests to the Lithuanian Supreme Council that it should discuss the possibility of declaring a temporary moratorium on the act of 11 March this year restoring an independent Lithuanian state, during the period of talks with the Soviet Union—with the USSR."

Rejection Likely

LD1806123690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1100 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Ceslovas Biskauskas commentary in the "Pulse of the Planet" program]

[Excerpts] According to observers, moods are becoming increasingly stronger, pointing to the fact that the proposal by the government to announce a moratorium of the independence act will be rejected by parliament. [passage omitted]

Foreign news agencies comment on the Lithuanian government's proposal concerning the independence proclamation act with their usual reserve, indicating the parliament will hardly accept this proposal. Conviction of its unacceptability is becoming increasingly stronger among the deputies. Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis has also expressed his doubts about the proposal. [passage omitted]

In the opinion of Kazimieras Motieka, parliament will not support it. Virgilijus Cepaitis thinks there cannot even be any discussion of the act's suspension. Algimantas Cepuolis told foreign correspondents that the proposal raises doubts because the Soviet Union never fulfilled its agreements with Lithuania.

Yesterday the Supreme Council Presidium rejected the possibility of the act's suspension.

More on Moratorium

AU1606181390 Paris AFP in English 1716 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 16 (AFP)—The Lithuanian government is proposing a moratorium on the republic's declaration of independence to break the current deadlock over negotiations with Moscow, the parliament's press office in Vilnius said.

The proposal, made Saturday by the Council of Ministers, will be put to parliament which, on March 11, adopted an unilateral declaration of independence from the Soviet Union, the spokesman said when reached by telephone.

Parliament is to meet on Tuesday.

According to Baltic Estonian news service, the Lithuanian government, headed by Premier Kazimiere Prunskiene, believes the moratorium could come into effect as soon as Moscow lift its economic blockade against the breakaway republic, imposed after the declaration of independence.

The moratorium would be temporary, while negotiations with Moscow are under way.

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev has said no negotiations on secession would be possible until Vilnius suspended its declaration of independence.

The Lithuanian government favours a "moratorium", rather than a "suspension" or "freezing" of the independence act, as this does not invalidate the declaration itself, according to the Estonian news service.

Breaking off negotiations would automatically end the moratorium, the agency added.

The government's proposal came on the day Moscow, as a sign of goodwill, eased its energy blockade of the republic, allowing new gas supplies to reach a fertilizer plant.

It follows a meeting of the Baltic presidents with Mr. Gorbachev Tuesday in Moscow.

'Moratorium' Considered a Priority

LD1606203390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] A Lithuanian government session chaired by Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene was held today.

The Lithuanian republic government's position regarding [word indistinct] question with the Soviet Union was discussed at the session.

The government proposes discussion by the Lithuanian Supreme Council of a schedule for announcing a temporary moratorium on the 11 March act to encompass the period of negotiations with the USSR.

In the government's estimation, the concept of a moratorium in this situation is a priority, as compared to concepts of halting or freezing, since the latter terms may be interpreted as invalidation of the act itself.

The government believes the moratorium should be declared now; however, it must come into effect only after cancellation of the Soviet Union's economic blockade against Lithuania and after an agreement concerning negotiations has been reached.

Landsbergis Views Appeal

LD1706165890 Prague CTK in English 1510 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Text] Riga/Vilnius June 17 (CTK correspondent)—Lithuanian President Vytautas Landsbergis has told CTK over phone that the Lithuanian parliament will next week undoubtedly discuss Saturday's appeal of the Lithuanian government to declare a temporary moratorium on the declaration of independence of March 11.

Vytautas Landsbergis pointed out, however, that at the same time the parliament will also carefully consider a number of other possibilities.

According to him, one of the variant how to satisfy Moscow, which conditions a dialogue on Lithuania's independence with revoking the March declaration of the Lithuanian parliament, could, for example, be the adoption of a decision that would not concern the declaration itself but only resolutions following from it.

The highest Lithuanian representative emphasized that the whole problem must be carefully considered. He failed to say when the voting on this issue can be expected in Vilnius.

More on Lithuanian Stance

LD1606232890 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Following today's Lithuanian government session, a report was issued by the Lithuanian Government Information Service on the Lithuanian government's position regarding consolidation of Lithuanian statehood.

It asserts that the current Lithuanian situation in the world is characterized by three factors: the strong determination by the Lithuanian people to restore and consolidate their independent state, and also the position espoused by many Western nations and by world opinion that urges the fastest possible solution of the Lithuanian problem, providing also the preconditions for finding international guarantees regarding this question. The third factor rests in the Soviet Union's readiness, demonstrated yesterday, to enter into compromises with the Lithuanian government and its active practical preparation for negotiations.

Our three months of independence have brought into focus the directions of Lithuanian economic restructuring to the East, as well as to the West. This allows for the beginning of the strengthening of Lithuania's economic ties with the Western market and also of defining the nature of its economic ties with the Soviet Union.

Our economic programs may become part of the assistance agenda to East European countries presently under discussion in the West.

In the opinion of the government, this is an opportune time to start negotiations with the Soviet Union. In carrying out the will of the Lithuanian people, the Lithuanian government regards the right to independence and the 11 March Act on the Restoration of Lithuanian Independence that consolidates it as indisputable.

The government proposes to the Lithuanian Supreme Council to discuss the possibility of announcing a temporary moratorium of the aforementioned act for the period encompassing negotiations with the Soviet Union.

The government considers the concept of a moratorium in this situation as of priority [prioritetine] over terms such as, cancellation, suspension, stiffening [sustandavimas] and freezing, since the latter terms may be interpreted as invalidation of the act itself. Moreover, a moratorium does not indicate cancellation of the act. It is a postponement, during the negotiations period, of the use of rights provided by the Independence Act. Moreover, the status of Lithuania as an independent state is not altered.

An interruption of negotiations indicates an automatic end to the moratorium. The government believes the moratorium should be declared now; however, it must come into effect only after cancellation of the Soviet Union's economic blockade against Lithuania and after an agreement has been reached concerning the negotiations.

Such a step by Lithuania will constitute an active and positive action, solidifying the position concretely expressed by both Eastern and Western political forces, to resolve the Lithuanian problem in a manner acceptable to all.

Sajudis Rejects Moratorium

LD1806105490 Vi lnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] The Sajudis Information Agency announces that a meeting was held by the Lithuanian Sajudis Vilnius Council to discuss the proposal put before the Supreme Council by the Lithuanian Council of Ministers to approve a moratorium of the Supreme Council 11 March act. A statement was not adopted yesterday, however its main theme did become apparent in the course of the discussions.

Participants in the meeting shared the opinion that the 11 March Act of the Restoration of Lithuania's Independence, cannot become an object for discussion. The 11 March act constitutes a juridical basis for the state. The words act and moratorium are juridically incompatible. Lithuania's situation is not exceptionally poor and so extraordinary reasons are lacking for making concessions.

The final variant of the declaration will be adopted today.

Demonstration Planned

LD1806112190 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1000 GMT 18 Jun 90

(Text) The Sajudis Information Agency reports that the Lithuanian Sajudis Vilnius Council has decided to organize a picket demonstration on Independence Square, at 1300, tomorrow. Taking part will be citizens of Vilnius who consider the 11 March Act on Restoration of Lithuania's Independence, as indisputable and its suspension, referred to as a moratorium, as unacceptable.

Yeltsin, Council To Send Supplies to Lithuania

LD1706174590 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1700 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Text] It was announced by POSTFAKTUM, an independent news agency in Moscow, that the Moscow City Council, where supporters of radical reforms have a majority, is planning to send oil to Lithuania in railway tank cars. During the journey the train will be guarded by members of the Moscow City Council.

It was also announced that Boris Yeltsin, the newly elected president of the Russian Federation, promised to start sending supplies to Lithuania.

Lithuanian Power Station Output Increased

LD1606103790 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 2045 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] On the instruction of the Soviet Government, from midnight on 15 June the Lithuanian state regional power station will be supplied with four million cubic meters of natural gas. This is 1.5 million cubic meters more than supplied hitherto. Having this additional supply the power station will put into operation yet another 150 megawatt unit. Elektrenai will be able to generate about 14 million kilowatt-hours of power in 24 hours.

Gas Supply Resumes to Azotas Factory

LD1606135990 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Summary] Chief engineer of the Azotas factory in Jonava, Vladas Gedviles, stated in an interview that from 1000 hours on 16 June the Jonava production association Azotas will be supplied with 3.5 million cubic meters of gas per day. Of course, after a prolonged idling of the factory many preparations have to be carried out, but by the end of next week the association should be able to work at its full capacity.

Vilnius Radio Carries 15 June Supreme Council

Landsbergis Speaks

LD1506113890

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0900 GMT on 15 June begins carrying a live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius. Deputy Kuzmickas is in the chair.

At this time, the announcer states that the leaders of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania are in the Presidium of the session.

At 0904 GMT the announcer states that 117 deputies of the Supreme Council are present. The session is attended by the delegations from Latvia, Estonia, Poland, a delegation from the interregional group of the USSR people's deputies and a delegation from Belorussia. A delegation from the republic of Moldavia will also take part in the session. He says that this session is devoted to the events of 15 June 1940, which resulted in the forcible incorporation of Lithuania into the Soviet Union.

At 0909 GMT Deputy Kuzmickas announces that the session should finish by 1600 (1300 GMT).

At 0911 GMT the chairman of the Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis, mounts the rostrum to deliver his report. He stresses that this session is extraordinary because it is devoted to the tragic events of 15 June 1940 which have led to Lithuania's incorporation into the Soviet Union. He asks that the deputies honor the memory of those who lost their lives as a consequence of these events with one minute's silence.

Landsbergis describes in detail events of that time, and mentions the latest events in Lithuania, paying special attention to the actions by Soviet servicemen in occupying buildings and beating up volunteers. He points out that the West German Chancellor Kohl has admitted Germany's responsibility in concluding the Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact, and asks whether a similar admission could not be made by another partner in this evil pact.

Lithuania's advance towards the restoration of independence was very difficult, says Landsbergis. After the Hitlerite invasion, it was once again occupied by its Eastern neighbor. The people of Lituania had to suffer deportations and arrests, collectivization of agriculture, and degradations. But the nation's spirit was not broken and an important part was played in this by the Lithuanian Catholic Church.

Landsbergis describes actions in Lithuania to restore independence, the response of Soviet authorities to these actions, and the blockade, and he affirms Lithuania's determination to advance along its chosen path.

At 0951 GMT Landsbergis concludes his report.

At 0952 GMT Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene is the next to speak. She deals with the known reasons why countries in the world do not wish to recognize Lithuania's independence. The Soviet Union should be the first to recognize Lithuania, she says. The coming negotiations will represent the first step in this recognition.

At 1012 GMT Deputy Kuzmickas announces that a delegation from Moldova has arrived.

At 1013 GMT Deputy Gajauskas, speaking on behalf of political prisoners and exiles, describes deportations under the Soviet occupation, armed resistance after World War II, and the underground movement. Under the continuing occupation armed resistance had to stop, but peaceful resistance continued and with the help of Sajudis, it has brought Lithuania to the proclamation of independence, says Gajauskas. In his opinion, the act of independence cannot be rescinded.

At 1026 GMT Deputy Chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet Krastins apologizes that he speaks in Russian, stresses the common fate of Lithuania and Latvia and the sufferings of both nations and expresses his hope that both countries will have the same future and friendly relations. All three Baltic states should be united he says; Moscow must not succeed in driving a wedge between them.

At 1035 GMT Deputy Chairman of the Estonian Supreme Soviet, (name indistinct), also speaking in Russian, describes the sufferings of the Baltic people under Soviet occupation and stresses that states basing themselves on force and coersion cannot exist forever and the process which has now started in the Baltic states and the Soviet Union is irreversible. There is no doubt that all three Baltic states will soon belong to the common European home, says the deputy.

At 1043 GMT Kuzmickas announces that a delegation of the Crimean Tartars is present in the hall.

At 1045 GMT the session is adjourned until 1130 GMT.

Foreign Occupation Remembered

LD1506141190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1115 GMT on 15 June resumes a live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 1117 GMT the announcer states that the session's delegation went to the Rasai Cemetery to lay wreaths and flowers at the graves of fighters for Lithuania's freedom. The delegation has returned to the hall and is taking part in the proceedings.

At 1121 GMT Deputy Kuzmickas, in the chair, invites the chairman of the Klaipeda town local government, Cepas, to the rostrum. Cepas recalls the Hitlerite occupation of Klaipeda where people did not feel the Soviet Union's armed aggression against Lithuania in 1940. They felt it only three years later when the Soviet Union "liberated" Lithuania and Klaipeda, says Cepas.

At 1127 GMT, Vytautas Adomaitis, chairman of the Joniskis local government, recalls deportations during the first and second Soviet ocucpations an the so-called class struggle in Lithuania which was, in fact, nothing but genocide. He appeals for determination by the Lithuanian people in these difficult times.

At 1132 GMT a Polish representative begins to speak in Polish. He states that the incorporation of the Baltic states into the Soviet Union cannot be justified, it was done by force. Lithuania's striving for independence has been and is supported by the parliamentary club of the Polish Sejm, he says. The Polish people share the hopes and aspirations of the Lithuanian people. All disagreements that existed in the past and may exist now between Poland and Lithuania must be solved by dialogue, respecting cultures and languages of both peoples.

At 1149 GMT Deputy Stasys Kasauskas beings to speak. He describes in moving terms the deportations in Lithuania. According to him, Lithuania lost every third resident during the war and through deportations.

At 1200 GMT first deputy chairman of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet states that he has no powers to speak in his capacity as deputy chairman, but will say a few words as a deputy. In his opinion, Lithuania sets an example to other republics in the Soviet Union. He complains about the process of assimilation in Belorussia where, if one hears people speaking Belorussian in Minsk, they are either writers or collective farmers; everybody else speaks usually Russian. He hopes that Lithuania, having gained independence, will treat national minorities on its territory with respect.

At 1207 GMT Mikhail Yevdokimov, actor at the Russian theater in Vilnius, speaking in Russian, stresses that if a nation really strives for independence, there is no force in the world able to stop it.

Kuzmickas mentions that the Orthodox Bishop (name indistinct) is present in the hall.

At 1217 GMT a Russian representative is the next to speak. He reads a poem devoted to the Lithuanian coat of arms.

At 1220 GMT a deputy from Moldavia expresses the admiration of his people for the striving of the Lithuanian people for independence, and stresses that Moldavia has already recognized independent Lithuania.

At 1228 GMT a member of the Crimean tartar national movement describes the striving of the Crimean Tartars to return from exile to their homeland and the obstacles created by the Soviet Government. The Crimean Tartars support Lithuania's struggle and are confident that the Lithuanian people will achieve their aim. He says that a truck with products donated by the Tartars has arrived in Lithuania.

At 1240 GMT a deputy maintains that the proclamation of independence could not be delayed and now it cannot be rescinded or suspended.

At 1247 GMT a deputy speaking on behalf of the Lithuanian Christian Democratic Party urges the deputies not to make unjustified concessions to Lithuania's partner in any coming negotiations. He reads his party's appeal to all nations.

At 1300 GMT a deputy asks the people of Lithuania to donate to the independence fund. He proposes to send a message to Paris because that city and Kaunas were occupied during the last war on the same day.

At 1305 GMT the minister of agriculture, Knasys, expresses gratitude to the Crimean Tartars for their gift and announces that Lithuania will donate to them several prefabricated houses.

At 1306 GMT Deputy Motieka reads a declaration of the Supreme Council on Lithuania's occupation. The declaration is adopted.

At 1312 GMT Deputy Stankevicius reads a letter to UN General Secretary asking for support to Lithuania's cause. The letter is adopted.

At 1317 GMT Deputy Saja reads an appeal to the people of Lithuania. It is adopted.

At 1320 GMT Landsbergis, in conclusion, thanks all who support Lithuania.

At 1323 GMT Kuzmickas closes the session. He announced that later on, a press conference will be held in this hall.

At 1325 GMT the state anthem of Lithuania is played.

At 1326 GMT the live relay ends.

Lithuanian Council Issues Appeals, Declarations

Appeals to UN

LD1506180390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1312 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Letter to UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar from the Lithuanian Supreme Council, read by Deputy Stankevicius at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius—live]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. Secretary General:

On 16 February 1918 Lithuania had restored the statehood it had cherished for centuries, and having overcome a multitude of obstacles, had established itself within the community of the world's nations as an independent state. In 1921 it was accepted into the League of Nations.

On 15 June, 1940, the anniversary our entire nation is commemorating today, the USSR embarked on armed aggression, occupied and incorporated Lithuania, as well as Latvia and Estonia, into the Soviet Union.

This brought the Lithuanian nation and Lithuanian national associations immeasurable suffering. Hundreds of thousands were deported. Annihilation of the population was carried out; a destruction of natural economic, political, and cultural structures was perpetrated and a totalitarian communist regime was imposed on our state.

Lithuania never has come to terms with that and, on 11 March, 1990 restored an independent republic of Lithuania, according to the decision of a new and democratically elected parliament, expressing its loyalty to universally acknowledged international principles and norms, and also in the hope of returning to the ranks of free nations.

However, violence again is being perpetrated against Lithuania. By armed means, the USSR is carrying out economic and political aggression against the republic of Lithuania, in crude violation of this organization's goals and principles, that are affirmed in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of Article 1 and paragraphs 3, 4 and 7 of Article 2 of the United Nations statute.

In obligating the adherence of a political path acceptable to all, the USSR [words indistinct] in searching for the most just statehood and democratic confirmation for Lithuania, according to paragraph 2 of Article 35 of the United Nations statute, the Lithuanian republic appeals to the United Nations Organization's Security Council and the General Assembly, proposing to include the Lithuanian and Baltic questions in the agenda of the nearest UN General Assembly session, in the hope that the world association of nations will support the rightful aspirations of the Lithuanian republic and its people.

Signed on behalf of the Lithuanian Supreme Council by its chairman.

Appeals to Lithuanian People

LD1506161290 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1317 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Appeal to the people of Lithuania adopted by the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius on 15 June; read by Deputy Saja—live]

[Text] Our homeland Lithuania, erased from the map of Europe by strangers, has revived. Its call for freedom has echoed throughout the world. Our wish to revive arises from our sorrow at seeing empty villages, at seeing our lagging behind the states of Europe, at seeing the surviving anxiety, and the physically and spiritually mutilated people. How do we rally all of them? How do we rally them for decent toil? How do we establish and consolidate independent Lithuania, a decent life?

Marking the anniversary of 15 June 1940, remembering all those tortured to death in prisons, all those in exile, those who lost their lives on Lithuanian soil, all those physically and spiritually crippled. Let us bow and concentrate; let us think about what to do so that this Lithuanian day of mourning makes our way easier tomorrow.

Let us condemn for all time mutual hatred, coercion, lies, and domination by dictators. Let us build a democratic society, in which each voice is heard and listened to calmly. Let us strengthen independent Lithuania and do everything so there is enough room for all people of goodwill, of all nationalities and views. Let us rally and oppose any split and mutual quarrels. Among the new and existing parties, societies, and movements, let us seek, above all, ideas and aims that unite rather than divide us. Let us give to Lithuania a man liberated from yesterday's darkness, whose life will be devoted to loving those close to him and his homeland. Let us say to ourselves: I will be that man.

Issues Declaration on Occupation

LD1506162690 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1306 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Declaration on the occupation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union, adopted at the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius on 15 June; read by Deputy Motieka—live]

[Text] Fifty years ago, on 15 June 1940, the USSR carried out an armed aggression against the republic of Lithuania, occupied it and annexed it. With these actions the USSR violated the norms of international law and violated agreements concluded with the republic of Lithuania according to which it was obliged to respect the independence and territorial integrity of Lithuania.

The world democratic states have never recognized the forcible incorporation into the USSR of Lithuania, which was a full member of the League of Nations. However, at that time, on the same 15 June another aggressor occupied Paris, the majority of European states were being occupied, and Lithuania had to rely on its own strength. Lithuania has never been reconciled to any kind of occupation and during these five decades of captivity, it has lost one-third of its inhabitants, resisted its subjugators by every possible means and cherished the hope of restoring its statehood. In recent years, when new opportunities have emerged, the movement for the nation's independence has become stronger. Fulfilling the mandate of the Lithuanian people, on 11 March 1990 we, its freely elected representatives, proclaimed the act of the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state.

However, the USSR, according to the decision of the Second Congress of People's Deputies in 1989, having acknowledged that secret agreements between the USSR and Germany were illegal and invalid from the moment they were signed and having condemned its 1939-40 policy of ultimatums and the violation of international agreements and now having proclaimed a new political thinking, continues to claim a conqueror's sovereignty over Lithuania, announces ultimatums to the republic of Lithuania and pursues a policy of coercion. Preventing Lithuania from establishing independent economic ties, isolating it from the world, the USSR Army blockades the borders of the republic of Lithuania and exerts control over the port of Klaipeda. Foreign citizens are not allowed to visit Lithuania.

Therefore, the Lithuanian Supreme Council states: While the USSR continues its policy of aggression against the three Baltic states—Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia—it is difficult to believe talk about a new European home and attempts to lay the firm foundations for it. The de facto implementation of the independence of the republic of Lithuania, the republic of Latvia and the republic of Estonia is a regional and international problem stipulating stability in Europe, and it must be solved urgently.

The leadership of the restored republic of Lithuania is prepared to start negotiations on this problem with the USSR leadership at any time. Lithuania, which has suffered for 50 years and made great sacrifices for freedom, today, in the conditions of economic and political coercion, hopes that it is not alone, that people of goodwill all over the world and the democratic governments will support and defend the legitimate striving for Lithuania's freedom and independence.

Work of Lithuanian Party Plenum Reported

LD1706155590

[Editorial Report] Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian at 0000 GMT on 17 June broadcasts a 15-minute report by Pranas Karlonas on the sixth plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee [LCP CC], held in Vilnius on 16 June. Karlonas says: "There is no room left for doubt. The name of this party will soon be changed. This question has already been voted upon near the plenum's conclusion today. Proposals were made to change the Lithuanian Communist Party's name. Two names were suggested: the Communist Party of the Lithuanian Republic, and the Communist Party of Independent Lithuania. The majority of participants at the plenum spoke out in favor of the first name. However, in the final analysis, a decision was made not to rush into this, but to wait."

Karbonas details a report by LCP CC First, Secretary Algirdas Brazauskas, entitled democracy and independence, in which Brazauskas remarks: Independence is of great value to Lithuania, as a condition for the nation's survival and its normal existence. However, Brazauskas notes: it is erroneous to renounce democracy and to postpone solutions of social, economic, and national problems in the name of independence. It is vital to declare clearly and unambiguously, in spite of all attacks, that independence is solely a condition for creating a democratic law-based state, to reform the economy, to provide maximum safeguards for social guarantees, and to free people's initiative and creativity. Karlonas says of Brazauskas that his principal ideas have been expressed within the plenum statutes concerning the LCP'S action priorities under current conditions. The document asserts, Karlonas says, that "The 11 March act is indisputable and irrevocable, and Lithuanian communists condemn those political forces whose activities are contrary to the nation's self-determination aspirations." The opposing forces have been named, for the first time, as CPSU platformists and the Yedinstvo organization. He says that the Lithuanian Communist Party's goal is a free and democratic Lithuania, adding, such activity is every Lithuanian Communist's obligation.

Karlonas adds: "the democracy accent comprised the principal focus of the plenum's activity. A transitional period was acknowledged as being vital to the actual consolidation of Lithuania's statehood."

Karlonas observes that "further party reform was advocated at the plenum." Discussions involved a regularly scheduled party congress, slated to take place in October or November this year. "Most pressing party questions will be presented for open discussion, prior to that time, he adds, saying that the Lithuanian Communist Party's national policy program was approved by the plenum.

"It must be noted," states Karlonas, that "ideas of those who spoke at the plenum, concerning the party's future, were not noted for their optimism. Party organizations are marked by considerable passivity. The party is not supplemented by new forces. Some individuals can still be found within the party who compromise the name of Lithuanian Communists." Academician Eduardas Vilkas is quoted in acknowledgings that the Lithuanian Communist Party holds much merit on the Lithuanian nation's behalf. However, Karlonas adds, its future is not bright.

"The party's fracture was forecast by a number of the plenum's participants and, figuritively speaking, they were already constructing other parties and movements from its ruins, since in their opinion silent existence of such parties within the LCP is well apparent even currently," Karlonas says.

According to Karlonas, the plenum's documents legitimize fractional activity within the party's structure.

In conclusion, Karlonas says that light of organizational matters, Kestutis Glaveckas was relieved of his duties as a result of his petition to be excused for health reasons.

Adopts Nationalities Policy Program

LD1606204690 Moscow TASS in English 1931 GMT 16 Jun 90

["Plenum of Breakaway Lithuanian Communist Party CC"—TASS headline; by TASS correspondent Kazis Uscila]

[Text] Vilnius June 16 TASS—A plenum of the breakaway Lithuanian Communist Party held today confirmed that the March 11, 1990 pact on the restoration of the independent Lithuanian state is undoubted and irreversible.

At the same time the plenum adopted the guidelines on the priorities of the Lithuanian Communist Party's activities in present-day conditions, which say that there is a need for a period of transition to consolidate real Lithuanian statehood.

The Lithuanian Communist Party holds that the republic's leadership should do its utmost to start negotiations with the USSR. As is known, the freezing of the pact on Lithuania's independence is Moscow's condition for the beginning of the talks.

Criticism of certain "little thought-out, unrealistic steps" of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet was made at the plenum. Its participants declared against attempts to restrict democracy, to bring pressure on those who disagree with the opinion of the parliamentary majority.

The Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee also adopted a programme of nationalities policy of the Lithuanian Communist Party, in which it, specifically, declared for territorial integrity of the Lithuanian state in the political and economic aspects, for equal constitutional, politial, social, economic and cultural rights and freedoms of Lithuania's citizens of every nationality.

A year ago the Lithuanian Communist Party had virtually full power and was the most influential political force in the republic. At the end of last year the Lithuanian Communist Party split into the breakaway party and the party that preserved unity with the Soviet Communist Party. The influence of each of the two Lithuanian Communist Parties on the republic's political and economic life is now minimal.

The breakaway Lithuanian Communist party now comes under the fire of criticism from every side. Some blame it for nationalistic, separatist aspirations and concessions to Sajudis, while others, on the contrary, blame it for betraying the ideas of independence.

Urges Talks With Moscow

LD1606184790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenum of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CPL] Central Committee was held in Vilnius today. Brazauskas, first secretary of the republic's Communist Party, delivered a report. TASS reports that as a result of discussion of the political and economic situation in the republic and also of the situation in the Communist Party, the CPL Central Committee determined priorities for the party's activities under present conditions.

Having confirmed that the act of 11 March this year restoring the independence of the Lithuanian state is incontestable and irrepealable, the CPL at the same time considers that with a view to implementing it, the republic's leadership ought to do everything possible to start talks with the USSR. The plenum participants adopted a program for the CPL's national policy and discussed several other issues.

Lithuanian Government Discusses Ties With Union

LD1606101390 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 0900 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Government spoksman Ceslovas Jursenas is at the microphone:

[Jursenas] Although today is Saturday, the government of the republic of Lithuania has started a meeting under the chairmanship of Prime Minister Prunskiene. Most attention was paid to the problem which concerns the whole of Lithuania, and not only Lithuania: the attitude of the government of the republic of Lithuania to the negotiations with the Soviet Union. Heated discussion took place in the search for solutions. Since at present the editorial commission is preparing a draft document, I cannot tell you anything about the contents. Listen to our news and you will be informed. [passage omitted]

Gorbunov Interviewed on Federation Council

LD1606222990 Moscow Maritime Service in Russian 1200 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Interview with Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, by unidentified correspondent; place, date of interview not given—recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Now, the promised interview with Anatoliy Gorbunov, chairman of the Latvian Supreme Soviet. As you recall, he attended, along with Vytautis Landsbergis and Arnold Ruutel, a reception with Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the USSR, and Ryzhkov, prime minister. But what was this meeting?

[Gorbunov] It is the beginning. Only the beginning. But, it seems to me that it is a good beginning. Why? Because for the first time at the Council of the Federation an atmosphere of amicability and equality reigned. So, if we are trying to reach agreement on something, then we are seeking agreement on an equal basis, and not as a boss with subordinates—because it is sometimes quite difficult for subordinates to reach agreement on something with a boss.

[Correspondent] How did Moscow's attitude to the Baltic seem to you? Does it bear some quality of comprehension of why these processes are occurring here and the real aspiration to let people know that Moscow has actually realized what is happening?

[Gorbunov] I can answer in the affirmative: yes, in other words, and can explain. There are no doubt many reasons for this and these need to be analysed in more detail. This will be my own, perhaps, subjective view of this problem. Firstly, there is the fact that the leaders of the republic who were actually there were all of the one opinion that the Union cannot exist in this form any longer—not because people do or don't like it but simply because it really has reached crisis point. That is the first thing.

Secondly, the processes that have been taking place in the Baltic are by no means unknown to other republics. After all, (?strange as it may seem) Russia has also been thinking about sovereignty and has not only been thinking about it but has actually declared it. Sovereignty is like that: it either exists or doesn't. Sovereignty in a state sense is the sovereignty and independence of a republic through the sovereignty and independence of the Supreme Soviet, but by the supremacy of which laws?

Russian attained sovereignty immediately, they immediately said which laws have supreme force within the republic, and everything falls into place. We have had an official meeting with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and his deputy and at the Council of the Federation, Yeltsin expressed a very specific notion of the further development of relations between the republics. He expressed the very simple and comprehensible notion that we should start by concluding treaties along the horizontal on a basis of equal rights and to our mutual advantage, with no political conditions of any kind, since these are very changeable and political life fervent [word indistinct] and the concept that something can be done even without the center is very constructive and new.

He went on to say let's conclude treaties, six or however many republics, in the first and then others. It appears that three points coincide in all the republics in these treaties, for example. This is already the basis for a new Union, isn't it? There's no need to think up some other treaty for a new or renewed federation or whatever.

As for a renewed federation, the Council had the idea of not using this term any longer, since if the Federation has not justified itself, if it really has reached such a crisis, then it is a matter of pure psychology that it is very difficult to renew something that is of no use. It will be new, completely new. For this reason the formula a union of sovereign states was put forward, which incidentally also corresponds to the development of the constitutional provisions that already exist in the Constitution of the USSR but which have never been complied with since there was no equality of rights.

[Correspondent] The USSR president has demanded or requested that for the duration of the talks, the declaration of the restoration of Latvia's independence be suspended. How, in reality, can this suspension of its validity take place? What form will this take?

[Gorbunov] We propose beginning talks and concluding an agreement which would define the legal status for the transitional period, a period of transition to effecting the state of independence and sovereignty of Latvia. We said what we mean and President Gorbachev listened carefully to all of it, as did Prime Minister Ryzhkov, and agreed that yes, such talks could be started and that our ideas could be developed and concluded in a concrete treaty on legal status because the situation is such that some people are saying we will only have the Latvian Republic Constitution and others that we will have only the USSR Constitution. In a situation like this, no one wins, however strong the arguments each may have—it just irritates people and what we must have is stability. That is why we need this legal status for the transitional period. However, Mikhail Sergeyevich did put forward his own demand, so to speak, request, wish—we'll use the word "request" after all, perhaps, thereby underlining that there is equality of rights: we made a request and got a request in return.

What I mean is that to freeze the declaration and implementation of the declaration for the duration of the talks. I conveyed this to the parliament.

[Correspondent] In other words, it is premature to speak of concrete actions for the moment, is that correct?

[Gorbunov] That's right. The concrete actions were in the form of our proposal and we received the same kind of concrete actions from the president, again in the form of a proposal. Next, work needs to be done.

[Correspondent] Is the main thing in Latvia still its road to restoring independence, or could it be all the same that we shall remain, albeit on a new basis, within the system of the Union or as before?

[Gorbunov] It is very hard to say something definite today as to how our economic and political life will develop in the future. Nonetheless, I can simply give my opinion, my own attitude. The formula: a union of independent states, which was recently used by Mikhail Sergeyevich is one that I can say I have been using for about two years now. All the same, it does not reflect precisely the whole essence of the matter because—what has been the main problem now? The main problem has been that there was a Union but within that Union there were no equal rights between the republic and the center. That is the main thing.

Nor was there a mechanism for bringing equality of rights into being. One way or the other, we have to proceed via sovereignty and independence of the republic. That is clear. How will this process advance? After all, everything is developing on the basis of a genuine political and economic situation and this is completely different within the republics.

For this reason it is now clear to everyone that not all the republics can have the same status. Even if someone says: an indissoluble union, a single union, and so forth, these are just words and the reality is quite different. All the same it develops from reality that a single model cannot be presented to everyone and everything will be just the same. That will never be so.

Therefore, and excuse me for taking so long but I should like to answer your very serious question, as I see it, like this: the main thing today is, all the same, to develop the sovereignty of the republics and cooperation between the republics and there is no need to be afraid that this cooperation will turn into being closed in some way. That is, that we will cooperate in words but essentially we will be closed in. Definitely not. Another process will take place. The person who has fewest opportunities has the greatest interest in cooperation. You will understand that it is possible to cast an eye over each republic from this point of view and ponder the interest it has in cooperation.

The other side of the issue is, of course, relations between the nationalities. This is a very complex issue. Our new state structures which are directed towards the independence of the republic must be built by democratic means and democratic means alone. This must be clear to everyone. People should not only have a theoretical acquaintance with matters of citizenship and other issues but should be able to sense that their concerns and interests are taken into account. There will be different atmosphere then because not taking people's interest into account means not having an influence on processes.

[Correspondent] Has the date of the talks and when they might be expected been determined, even approximately?

[Gorbunov] The date of the talks has been determined as follows: if the Supreme Soviet of Latvia agrees with President Gorbachev's proposal, the talks begin two days after the freezing of the implementation of our declaration for the duration of the talks.

[Correspondent] From the mood of the deputies do you think they will agree to this step or will there be some resistance?

[Gorbunov] Well, there will be resistance and in no small degree. I cannot say or claim today that this step is the most correct step but it is a real step because if we simply do nothing and think that we are already an independent state, that will be worse than a freeze for the duration of the talks.

[Correspondent] The time-scale of the transitional period has not yet been decided. What do you think it will be like?

[Gorbunov] We have no practice of this. I haven't either but I think that if, let's say, we could solve our problems within two years, that would be a good thing. I, for example, look at my duties today and my concerns, apportioned me by those duties and, of course, I don't want it just to be declarations of some kind again, or statements and promises but for people to become aware of stability in that time, to become aware of stability not only in their thoughts but in their daily life as well. I would then be able to think that we were already bringing that period to a close.

[Correspondent] Is there a program, calculated by scientists, for that period so that it does not only consist of suppositions but of a precise, accurate and scientifically developed program which when implemented would not make people feel that their lives had worsened and become more complicated but that they could move smoothly to some subsequent state of life?

[Gorbunov] Right. Sadly, there are no such precise calculations and this is not linked so much just with us, as with the situation in the Union as a whole. After all, with the switch to elements of the market, or as they say, of a regulated market, economy is connected to the whole Union and we can adopt whatever laws we like here—but we don't know what the miners, will say to it or what situation will develop in, for example, Sverdlovsk or at the giants of industry, or where oil is found and so forth.

[Correspondent] In other words, for the moment we remain within the integrated economic mechanism of the Soviet Union?

[Gorbunov] Yes. True, this integrated mechanism does not satisfy us at all. Yes and at the center, Premier Ryzhkov is stressing that he is no longer going to deal with the redistribution of nails, as he graphically put it. That is, this integrated mechanism is, unfortunately, no longer functioning and we cannot rely any longer on its giving us results and it is for this reason that what Boris Yeltsin spoke of is beginning. We need to transfer as a matter of urgency to horizontal links between the republics.

RSFSR

Reportage on 18 June Congress Proceedings

Agenda Reported

LD1806070690 Moscow TASS in English 0658 GMT 18 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation continues its work today. It is to discuss and adopt the decree on power, Russian Chairman Boris Yeltsin said.

The congress has been working for over a month now but there are still many issues to discuss.

The congress is expected to hear and discuss a programme report by the republic's Prime Minister Ivan Silayev, appointed by the Russian parliament, and approve Russia's prime minister. [sentence as received]

The congress is also to sanction the appointment of the republic's chief state arbiter.

Silayev Endorsed

LD1806083690 Moscow TASS in English 0826 GMT 18 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—Ivan Silayev was today endorsed as the chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation by the first Congress of Russia's People's Deputies, with 699 deputies voting for him, 137 against, with 33 abstentions.

Speaking at the congress today, Silayev outlined his programme and answered deputies' questions.

Silayev Outlines Program

LD1806103790 Moscow TASS in English 1020 GMT 18 Jun 90

[By TASS parliament correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—The Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation today confirmed Ivan Silayev as the new head of the Russian government.

"The government's main aim will be to activate the economic mechanism that should ensure Russia's real economic independence as a sovereign state in the fold of the Soviet Union," Silayev said.

Delivering a report at the congress today, Silayev said that the unbalanced interrepublican goods turnover led to the covert financing of other Union republics from Russia's budget.

The Russian Federation's annual payments to the Union Fund exceed R100 billion. At the same time, it receives some R30 billion from the Union budget, Silayev said. He said the government planned to take measures to fill the gap in mutual payments later this year.

Silayev described "full economic freedom of all producers on its territory" as an important condition for strengthening the Russian Federation's sovereignty.

He said the government planned to sell to private owners small enterprises in the sphere of services, consumer goods and domestic construction materials production and agricultural products' processing. The Russian market will be opened for foreign firms.

Silayev paid considerable attention to his programme to revive Russian villages and plans in the social field. He stressed the need to safeguard interests of the population, especially low-income groups.

Moscow TV Relays 17 June Congress Proceedings

Health, Refugee Matters Viewed

LD1706151890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT ON 17 June begins carrying a recording of the Congress of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) People's Deputies 17 June session held in the Kremlin.

The session is being chaired by Ruslan Imranovich Khasbulatov.

At this time, the chairman requests deputies to be seated.

A Bashkir deputy calls for all deputies to be represented on committees and commissions.

A Bryansk deputy reads out a letter from the children's home in Bryansk Oblast appealing for more aid to disabled children.

At 1406 GMT the chairman conveys congratulations to health workers, whose festive holiday falls today.

Deputy Silayev calls for time to be allotted for discussion of a decision on refugees.

Deputy Klepikov of Arkhangelsk calls for aid to health workers.

At 1410 GMT Deputy Veretenikov calls for transportation facilities to be made available for all deputies.

Deputy Kulakovskiy says that the decree on power should not be discussed today but should be looked at by a joint session under the chairmanship of the Supreme Soviet chairman.

Deputy Ushashkin reads out points on formation of the Supreme Soviet and the status of and confidence accorded to deputies. Objections are made from the floor and the chair to his procedural comments and his allegations suggesting the chairman of the sitting is improperly using his authority to silence deputies.

Deputy Varukhin from Yaroslavl Oblast reads a message from his electorate calling for transfer to the market economy but criticizing the government program for this.

A Rostov Oblast deputy calls for an answer to previous demands for the Rostov Nuclear Electric Power Station construction to be halted. A regional strike has been threatened unless action is taken. The deputy hands the message over in written form to be conveyed to Yeltsin.

At 1420 GMT Deputy Khubiyev confirms Yeltsin's nonpresence at the session by saying he regrets Yeltsin is not present at today's sitting. The draft RSFSR Constitution has many defects he says. Khubiyev defends Abdulatipov, who was yesterday accused of nationalism, and calls for proper ethical conduct by deputies.

At 1424 GMT Deputy Sayenko complains about unethical conduct by deputies of various deputy groups, and calls for an end to such narrowly ambitious ploys. To great applause, he disregards the chairman's call to finish and enumerates the heroic feats of the party.

At 1428 GMT the chairman calls for deputies to register: 837 deputies are present, 707 are necessary for a quorum. The chairman goes on to beg deputies not to be too hasty in criticizing the composition of the Supreme Soviet; the chair will do all it can to ensure the procedure goes ahead smoothly and fairly. The chairman runs through the agenda for today—74 deputies have asked to speak on the first point, discussion and adoption of a decision on the priority laws. A vote is taken on giving five minutes to each speaker; the motion is passed 753 to 27, with six abstentions.

At 1435 GMT a deputy calls for a vote on debating the formation of committees and commissions today. This is put to the vote: it is not passed.

Deputy Guryevich and other deputies speak from the floor calling for this issue to be decided and included on the agenda.

At 1440 GMT a vote is taken on the length deputies are to speak; it is adopted 645 to 112, with 17 abstentions.

At 1442 GMT Deputy Serdyukov of Leningrad constituency speaks on the poor state of rayons and villages, calling for more efforts by rayon soviets.

At 1446 GMT Deputy Serdyukov is cut off in midsentence by an announcement that a football relay from Italy is to be broadcast. It is announced that the relay from the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies will be resumed at 2115 Moscow time (1715 GMT).

Local Problems Cited

LD1706190890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1715 GMT on 17 June resumes a recording of the 17 June session of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies held in the Kremlin.

At 1715 GMT Khasbulatov, in the chair, gives the floor to Seredyukov. Serdyukov says they should discuss the work of local authorities; this is important because local affairs are in such a sorry state. Local authorities even below the level of rayon soviet must have powers, so as to prevent things getting bogged down in bureaucracy. Competent managers must be trained.

At 1720 GMT, Deputy Bezrukov says he wants to add just one point to the resolution, instructing the Supreme Soviet to ensure that young people take part in drafting legislation

At 1723 GMT Deputy Yakimenko comes to rostrum. She says that it is unfair that workers get extra payment for living in areas with harsh conditions, while students and others do not. The Ministry of Defense should be obliged to help local authorities which have to help house servicemen stationed in their areas. Cancellation of Vladivostok's status as a "closed" town has caused problems. Yakimeko finally notes an unfair application of pension rights for women who have worked in the Ministry of Interior.

At 1729 GMT Deputy Pudovkin speaks about safety of work at atomic power stations.

At 1734 GMT Deputy Smolskiy objects from the floor to the fact that deputies are not speaking in accordance with the agenda and requests that discussions which are not in accordance with points on the agenda be ceased.

At 1736 GMT an unidentified deputy from Podolsk speaks about the law on local self government. He calls for local soviets to be given more, real power and financial autonomy. He cites problems in his home town and states that they could be better solved on the spot. Regional soviets could be set up to solve problems common to a region.

At 1742 GMT a deputy from Bryansk Oblast speaks about eliminating the consequences of the Chernobyl accident. The radioactive contamination of areas of Russia should not be forgotten, he says. Bryansk Oblast should be recognized as having suffered as a result of the accident. He quotes mortality figures for mothers and children and demands that a law on the protection of mothers and children be adopted.

At 1746 GMT Deputy Barmin comes to the rostrum. He proposes that a law on environmental protection be considered. Barmin says that a law on the status of RSFSR deputies needs to be adopted during the first session of the congress, and speaks about the necessity for a law on entrepreneurship in relation to the future transition to a market economy.

At 1749 GMT Deputy Polozkov expresses his opinions on what needs to be achieved before the transition to market relations is achieved. The issue of ownership is of paramount importance and should be discussed.

At 1754 GMT Deputy Khabibullin alludes to the adoption of the sovereignty declaration. He reads out an appeal made by representatives of the Tartar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic (ASSR) to Gorbachev asking that their interests be taken into account if Russia proclaims sovereignty, and states that the sovereignty declaration will not be valid on the territory of the Tartar ASSR.

At 1759 GMT Deputy Patnikov speaks about the necessity of resolving economic problems to the satisfaction of autonomous republics. Laws on property and taxation should be elaborated. A special commission should be formed to look after interests of ethnic minorities.

At 1804 GMT an unidentified deputy at the rostrum complains that time is being wasted on details of laws, not general concepts.

At 1805 GMT Deputy Polosin says reforms are threatened by the increase in crime. The congress has made declarations, but not helped in a practical sense. Conditions for law enforcement officers must be improved. Polosin appeals for consideration for people living in Magnitogorsk, which is almost as polluted as Nakhodka.

At 1810 GMT Deputy Kalashnikov speaks in favor of giving local authorities more powers. A law on land must be adjusted with this in view, as must a law on ownership. The RSFSR Government has to adopt measures in view of planned change to market economy, he says.

General Debates

LD1706193990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1814 GMT on 17 June continues carrying a recording of the 17 June session of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies held in the kremlin.

At this time, Deputy Leeta notes how long the congress has continued, how it has discussed poor conditions in various areas. But, she says, problems of women have been ignored. She quotes some figures on women involved in heavy and dangerous work. Law on health is a priority, she says.

At 1820 GMT Deputy Arslanova proposes that a law be drafted as a priority concerning extra pay in the Far North. A law on mineral wealth should also be passed, giving profits from local resources to local people. Antimonopoly legislation is neded, he says.

At 1824 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks attacking the Secretariat, changing that only selected people are being given an opportunity to speak.

Another deputy was to have spoken, after having been overlooked previously by Khasbulatov, but an outcry in the hall prevents him. A vote is taken on concluding debate. Khasbulatov defends the Secretariat while the vote is being taken. The vote is in favor of ending the debate. Khasbulatov says there have been many proposals, from speakers and on paper, and quotes a few. He calls for a vote on taking the drafts which have been submitted as a basis for work.

At 1832 GMT an unidentified speaker from the floor proposes rewording of the resolution to make it clear when laws are to become effective. Deputy Krasavchenko says the draft resolution is inadequate, in that it is partly about drawing up new laws and partly about bringing laws into line with Union laws. Another deputy suggests that a law on referendums is a priority, referring to the declaration on sovereignty.

At 1836 GMT, Khasbulatov calls for a 30-minute break.

At 1837 GMT the recording continues with coverage from the session after the break. Khasbulatov is still in the chair. He says 15 minutes will be allowed for general debate. A deputy from Zagorsk talks about the town's historic monuments. He reads a constituent's suggestion that people who speak too long be fined. Leningrad deputy says the debate has been too vague. Drafts should be adopted as a basis and debated point by point. He calls for the outline of economic reform to be included in the agenda.

At 1841 GMT a deputy from Omsk says a law on help for invalids is a necessity. Deputy Kuznetsov speaks against adopting the draft resolution, since none of the draft laws agrees with the agenda. He criticizes various aspects of the draft resolution and calls for redrafting.

At 1845 GMT a deputy from Khakassia says the draft can be accepted as a basis, but suggests an addendum on economic rights of autonomous republics.

At 1846 GMT the relay breaks off. The announcer says it will be resumed "after the soccer match." No time is given.

Deputies' Rights Considered

LD1706222690

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2058 GMT on 17 June resumes a recording of the 17 June session of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies held in the Kremlin. The recording backtracks to beginning of the statement by Medyukov, from Khakassia, which was first broadcast at 1845 GMT. The draft can be taken as basis, with some amendments, he says.

At 2100 GMT Deputy Kolokovskiy says the resolution should include a separate point about popular education. Deputy Fedotov from Kursk demands a point covering health care. Deputy Grigoryev makes another point about health care.

At 2102 GMT a deputy from Tataria speaks in support of pensioners' rights, says a law on pensions is needed. He speaks in support of the communists of Russia deputies. Khasbulatov cuts him off for deviating from the subject.

At 2105 GMT Deputy Ovchinnikov refers back to the decree of sovereignty, and suggests the agenda should include an outline for the RSFSR's economic development.

At 2107 GMT an unidentified deputy complains that the agenda has not been followed and that is why the discussion is so messy. Khasbulatov defends the way the presidium has prepared for the debate. Asks if they want to continue debate. A vote is taken on ending discussion: it is in favor of ending it.

At 2112 GMT Deputy Travnikov says less time would be wasted if everybody had the written material beforehand.

At 2113 GMT a vote is taken on accepting the draft resolution as basis; it is adopted 552 to 213.

At 2114 GMT an unidentified deputy says they have omitted a most important draft, on protection of democracy. He warns that the communists of Russia could subvert democracy.

At 2115 GMT Khasbulatov says there are many suggestions to be considered, names some of their authors, and asks them to help refine the document. The adoption of the final document will probably have to wait for tomorrow, he says.

At 2117 GMT Khasbulatov says the next item is on the status of the RSFSR people's deputy and he suggests one hour for debate. The vote on time limit is in favor, but there is no quorum, so board says rejected. Deputies are asked to register. Board now shows 865 present. Vote on the debate procedure is taken again; 683 in favor; it is now passed.

At 2122 GMT Deputy Sokolov from Leningrad Oblast complains that time is being wasted by discussing the status of deputies as a primary law. Deputy Kachanov agrees, says he agrees with Yeltsin that this decision should be deferred. Deputy Selevanov asks how they can discuss something that they do not have in hand. Khasbulatov says the topic is on the agenda at the deputies' request.

At 2124 GMT Deputy Malkov says the law on local soviets should take precedence over the status of deputies. Deputy Shumskiy asks the presidium to cut anyone off if they speak off the point. Deputy Krasavchenko says they can discuss a drafted document or have a discussion, and suggests they get on with discussion so a document can be drafted.

At 2129 GMT Deputy Vasilyev begins the debate by recalling the existing law, says a minimum of necessary powers must be granted until the actual law is passed on the status of deputies. He makes proposals on time off work, recompense, deputies obligation to respond to voters' questions, rights to visit offices to get the answers. A deputy should be able to have up to three assistants paid out of public funds, he suggests.

At 2134 GMT Deputy Kazakov says the deputies should have voting rights in committees and commissions, and casting votes in lower soviets in their own constituencies.

At 2137 GMT Deputy Teterin says current legislation makes the deputy dependent on executive bodies. Deputies must have material and legal guarantees enabling them to carry out their duties. They must have transport, telephone, and paid assistants.

At 2141 GMT Deputy Bondarev says the congress must agree at least a minimum set of deputies' rights or they are wasting their time. A deputy needs an assistant. Funds must be available to consult experts.

At 2144 GMT Deputy Shikharev says his points have already been covered; asks people to put forward their suggestions in writing to the presidium.

At 2145 GMT Deputy Shakhray is given the floor. He says the congress must agree at least on the provisional statute about deputies' status before the end of the session. Deputies must have free access to telephones. More office space is needed in the Supreme Soviet; he suggests other bodies which might have a surplus, for instance the People's Control Committee. Transport must be provided.

At 2151 GMT Deputy Kudinova agrees that some decision must be adopted at this congress.

At 2152 GMT Deputy Stepanov says he has already put his proposals in writing. He gives a brief account of redrafting of points in the Constitution he is suggesting to cover status of people's deputy. Deputies should have wide powers to participate in work of Supreme Soviet.

At 2159 GMT Deputy Kotenkov complains that the issue is having to be debated without proper preparation. The law on status should be adopted at the next congress at the latest. He suggests that the Supreme Soviet be instructed to draft a law for adoption at the next congress. He proposes that a point be included in the draft on guaranteeing tickets to deputies on their first request.

Procedural Matters Discussed

LD1706225790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2205 GMT on 17 June continues carrying a recording of the 17 June session of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies held in the Kremlin.

At this time an unidentified deputy speaks about the importance of democracy. He complains, as a previous deputy did, about the absence of the document on which the present discussions are supposed to be based.

At 2209 GMT Khasbulatov asks deputies if they wish to continue discussion—they decide that they do.

At 2210 GMT an unidentified female deputy makes a point about the absence of transport for deputies.

At 2211 GMT the issue of ceasing discussion is put to the vote: it is adopted by 498 votes to 30. Khazbulatov suggests that voting be carried out on a resolution requesting that the Supreme Soviet prepare a draft law on status for discussion at the next session of the congress.

At 2215 GMT an unidentified deputy speaks from the floor complaining about not being able to present his own draft of the resolution.

At 2218 GMT Vasilyev speaks from the rostrum expressing the view that this congress must at least grant deputies provisional powers. Several deputies make suggestions about what they should be adopting.

At 2222 GMT Khasbulatov proposes that a draft from Shakhray's group be discussed tomorrow as a basic document. Deputies vote on the proposal: proposal adopted 774 votes to 24.

At 2224 GMT Deputy Tarasov suggests that the document must be in line with the decree on sovereignty.

At 2225 GMT Khasbulatov calls for a vote on closing the sitting early to allow working through of the notes that have been sent to the presidium. The vote is in favor. Khasbulatov opens the floor for "any other business."

At 2227 GMT Deputy Etterentyra from Chukotka is given the floor. She complains that some deputies are trying to get more than their share of speaking time by procedural tricks.

AT 2231 GMT Deputy Kuznetsov calls for documents to be available before continuing discussion on status of deputies.

At 2232 GMT there are announcements of meetings.

At 2234 GMT an unidentified deputy reads the proposed appeal to the USSR Supreme Soviet calling for the restoration of Solzhenitsyn's citizenship; it is to be put up for a vote in any other business tomorrow.

At 2235 GMT Khasbulatov adjourns session.

Further Reportage on 17 June Congress Session

'Priority Laws' Discussed

LD1706132390 Moscow TASS International Service in Rusian 1103 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 June (TASS)—TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin report from the Kremlin:

Today's sitting of the First Congress of People's Deputies of Russia was devoted to a discussion of a list of the priority laws of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. In the draft distributed to the deputies, there were 19 draft laws, including laws on local self-government and the local economy of the RSFSR, on the federal and national state structure, on political parties and public organizations, and on education and culture.

During the discussions, the deputies emphasised that bills developed and adopted by the Union parliament should be the foundation for republican laws. At the same time, noted many speakers, Union laws contain a good many shortcomings and these bills are therefore in need of further working and improvement at the republican level. Thus, Deputy Oleg Smolin, a teacher at one of the institutes in Omsk, called on the Russian legislators to pay particular attention to working out laws that regulate the transition of the republic's economy to market relations. It is essential, in his opinion, to adopt a whole packet of laws, in particular, on land, on property, and on enterprise and to work out antimonopoly legislation.

Deputies representing various oblasts and professional groups spoke, primarily, about the pressing problems of their own territories or industries, calling on the legislators to pay particular attention to these when working out the draft laws. Thus, priority should undoubtedly go, in the opinion of deputies who are doctors, to laws on the people's health and on protecting mothers and children. Representatives of the national autonomous formations drew their colleagues' attention to the importance of laws regulating relations between nationalities in the Russian Federation and restoring the rights of peoples forcibly removed from their age-old places of residence in the years of Stalin's repressions.

Proposals were also heard to add a number of important provisions to the list of priority draft laws, especially relating to matters of environmental protection and guaranteeing the safety of the local population during the use of nuclear installations. Adoption of a final decision on the proposed draft, taking into account the numerous additions and amendments submitted to the course of today's discussion, has been postponed until tomorrow. It is expected that the first congress will conclude its work on Monday 18 June.

Tatar Deputy Reads Appeal

LD1706214190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1754 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Address by Deputy Khabibullin, from the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, at the 17 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies at the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] I am Deputy Khabibullin, from the 864th Constituency of the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR]. Respected Presidium, respected people's deputies, I request your attention for several minutes. I will not take up much of your time. In discussing the issue of the preparation of legislative acts of Russia, I would like to highlight one issue: As is well-known, on 12 June we here in this hall adopted a declaration on sovereignty. During the process of discussing the declaration, representatives from autonomous areas repeatedly drew attention to the fact that before the declaration was adopted as a whole, this draft should have been discussed in the autonomous formations.

Two days after the adoption of this declaration, that is, on 14 June, on the eve of the 70th anniversary of the Tatar ASSR, a rally was organized in the social center in Kazan at which an appeal addressed to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the country, and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR], was adopted. Allow me to read the main part of this text:

Appeal by the participants in a rally of the workers of Tatariya organized by the Tatar Social Center and the Committee of the Public on the Preparations for Changing the Status of the Tatar Republic.

To Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, president of the country, and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet:

The Tatar public is attentively observing the progress of the First Congress of People's Deputies in Russia, and we are forming the impression that our very profound aspirations are remaining unheard at the congress. The striving to declare Russia's sovereignty without the prior adoption of laws on the sovereignty of state formations that are part of the Russian Federation should be qualified as usurpation of the sovereign rights of the peoples living on the territory of Russia. Russia's sovereignty cannot be determined by deputies voting. It is determined by agreement among free subjects with equal rights who delegate part of their rights to federative bodies. An independent free state may be the subject of a federation, but the oblasts, krays, and towns [words indistinct] in any way, for the latter have neither constitutions nor supreme soviets.

For this reason, the adoption of a law on the sovereignty of Russia by the congress of deputies in Russia will not have juridical force in Tatariya. There are no grounds for limiting the sovereignty of Tatariya within the Russian Federation or within the USSR, for national sovereignty lies at the basis of state sovereignty, which in principle cannot be limited by anyone or anything. These rights are secured in the declaration of the rights of the peoples of Russia, in international pacts, and in the USSR Constitution. Any other approach to issues of sovereignty represents a disregard for the rights of nations to self-determination.

Deeply respected Mikhail Sergeyevich and Boris Nikolayevich, the public of Tatariya sincerely hopes that the proclamation of the state sovereignty of the republic and the enhancement of its political and economic status on the basis of self-determination within the framework of the USSR will be interpreted correctly by you and will find support here.

[Signed] The participants in the rally, Freedom Square, Kazan, 14 June 1990.

The presidium has this appeal. The autonomous formations request the people's deputies to approach the adoption of legislative acts, decisions, and declarations in an extremely delicate fashion. We would request people's deputies to take this request into account and return to Article 9 of the declaration on sovereignty and to Article 116 of the Constitution. Our neighbors, deputies from the Bashkir ASSR, support me in this issue, and ten million people live in these two republics. We would ask Comrade Abdullatipov, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, to assemble the members of the Soviet of Nationalities and the autonomous formations during the interval to work out their position on this issue.

Thank you for your attention.

Confrontation Continues

LD1706134690 Moscow TASS in English 1331 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksyonov]

[Text] The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation has been working in the Kremlin for the whole month. This seems to be long enough to clear up the positions of individual deputies and deputy groups, and understand that confrontation will lead the congress to a deadlock and that a reasonable compromise is the only way to ensure effective work.

Unfortunately, today's morning session again demonstrated confrontation in its sharpest form. Speaking on behalf of a group of extreme radicals, People's Deputy Sergey Yushenkov (Moscow) expressed discontent with the Russian Supreme Soviet (parliament) elected last week. He suggested calling for a vote of confidence to the parliament in which, according to him, deputies opposed to all democratic reforms are prevailing. He and other radicals emphasised that they would not take the position of "passive compromise" and declared their readiness to form an opposition.

The speech of Deputy Gennadiy Sayenko (the Kursk region, central Russia), representing the group Communists of Russia, sounded as counterbalance to Yushenkov. He accused some people's deputies of trying to satisfy their narrow political ambitions at any cost, even by compromising other deputies. He also said that an anti-communist spirit was being imposed at the congress and that some deputies were waging a campaign to launch a mass persecution of nearly 20 million communists.

But, does anybody really gain from this confrontation and mutual assaults? The group of the independent, which is seeking rapprochement between the opposing groups, and its deputy Yuri Matochkin (the Kaliningrad region, north-western Russia) believe that such confrontation will lead the congress nowhere.

It is an obvious fact that most deputies are lacking the experience of parliamentary work. But, the burden of problems pressing on the Russian Federation leaves them little time to learn. The electorate is waiting for effective solutions rather than mutual assaults.

The congress, which opened more than a month ago, is expected to close on Monday.

Deputies are yet to resolve a number of major issues. They are to instruct the newly elected Supreme Soviet (parliament) of the Russian Federation to draft top priority laws, and to endorse several appointees, including the chairman of Russia's Council of Ministers.

Judging by some speeches at today's morning session, deputies will also focus on principles of forming standing committees of the Supreme Soviet and commissions of its chambers.

Moscow TV Relays 16 June Congress Proceedings

Chernobyl, Prices Viewed

LD1606153490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 16 June carries a recorded relay of the 16 June session of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Congress of People's Deputies in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1400 GMT RSFSR Chairman Yeltsin calls on deputies to stand and salute the RSFSR flag. Next, Yeltsin says the chairman of the Dagestan Supreme Soviet Presidium is 60, therefore he should be greeted on his birthday.

Fifteen minutes are allowed for miscellaneous questions. Deputy Lovkin from Bryansk talks about the Chernobyl accident. Why has the congress decision on Chernobyl not been published? he asks. Efforts have been made to find out why, but no reasonable answer has been received. It must be published, he says: I appeal to Yeltsin to do something about this. Yeltsin says this is a blunder and will be dealt with. Two oblasts involved don't want it published, but it should be published very soon, he notes.

At 1405 GMT Bark from Krasnoyarsk talks about the constitutional commission, for which he ran as a candidate. He says some of the deputies from Krasnoyarsk region have misled the session and its chairman. The deputy apologizes for this. Yeltsin says the mistake will be rectified.

Rogacheva from Murmansk congratulates Yeltsin on his election on behalf of the fishermen of the North. These fishermen now make a plea to Yeltsin to make sure the

Fisheries Ministry makes good its promises to the fishermen. There are colossal difficulties in this industry, she says. The industry needs to be granted economic autonomy. The country depends greatly on these fishermen, she concludes. She hands over a letter to Yeltsin.

A deputy from Ulyanovsk talks about the price rises. The workers from this region hope that the congress will not allow these price rises to go ahead. He says a motor works at Ulyanovsk is short of components. As a result it is at a standstill. Light industry in the region is also experiencing difficulties. Mothers of conscripts called up to the Soviet army do not want their sons sent to the southern republics.

Next, Deputy Rossanovich, speaking from the floor, thanks Russian Health Minister Potapov for his conscientious attitude to his work. He talks about the importance of deputies being given correct and full answers to their questions by ministries and departments. He criticizes broadcasting Chief Nenashev for delaying Yeltsin's interview.

Deputy Kuzmin from Khimki in Moscow Oblast talks about the results of voting in the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He says some deputies are trying to sabotage the work of the Supreme Soviet, to make it ineffective. A distinction has been made between deputies who are members of the Supreme Soviet and those who are not.

Deputy Podoprigorya criticizes the lack of a quorum at some sessions. He calls for a change to the Constitution, so that commissions of both chambers are set up on a joint basis.

Deputy Fedorchenko talks about the declaration on sovereignty. He asks who is going to enforce the republic's sovereignty. The central Soviet prosecutor, for example, is still appointing prosecutors in the RSFSR. He calls for a vote on this.

At 1418 GMT it is announced that questions time is over.

Supreme Soviet Elections Debated

LD1606154290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At 1420 GMT Yeltsin asks the deputies to register. There are 891 present. The quorom is 707. Yeltsin talks about the election of chairmen and deputy chairmen of the two chambers of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He says the successful candidates should be congratulated and asked to take their places on the presidium. He calls for a vote on this. Isakov has been elected chairman of the Soviet of the Republic, with Vishnyakov as deputy chairman, and Abdulatipov has been elected chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities, with Volkogonov as deputy chairman. The motion is passed by 743 for and 102 against, and the successful candidates take their places in the presidium.

At 1423 GMT Yeltsin lists the items on the agenda. The first one is by-elections to the Supreme Soviet. He lists the towns and oblasts which lack deputies.

Ostronkov from Kalinin Oblast explains the situation in his oblast. He recommends a certain Smolskiy as a deputy to the Supreme Soviet. He calls on the congress to elect Smolskiy. This nomination is challenged by Bragin, who wants a secret vote.

Filatov, a Democratic Russia deputy, says he want to make a short statement on behalf of the bloc. He says an especailly abnormal situation has developed as regards the election of deputies from Moscow Oblast. The deputies who have been elected for Moscow Oblast are not wanted by the voters of Moscow Oblast. The deputy asks for careful attention to be paid to the candidates nominated by the Moscow deputies' group. He nominates Medvedev and Rumyantsev as members of the Supreme Soviet.

At 1430 GMT Deputy Sapayev from Kemerovo Oblast names worthy candidates from the Kuzbass for election to the Supreme Soviet. Another congress deputy from Kemerovo Oblast says he wishes to be elected to the Supreme Soviet. Deputy Varov talks about the nomination of candidates from Leningrad. He calls on the congress to endorse these nominations. Deputy Belov from Tver talks again about the candidates from Kalinin Oblast on the subject of nomanations. He says Bragin is a better candidate than Smolskiy. Bragin takes an active part in subbotniks, he is a good communist, trying to save the honor and reputation of the party.

At 1436 GMT Vedernikov from Moscow takes issue with the Democratic Russia bloc and nominates Kononov as a member of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet: He is a lawyer and we need more lawyers. Krasavchenko, also from Moscow, nominates Nikolay Ilyich Travkin, whose qualities he praises: without Travkin the Russian Supreme Soviet will be a poorer place. He compares Travkin's qualities with those of the late Andrey Sakharov.

A deputy from Leningrad talks about the arguments going on in Leningrad about who should represent the city. He nominates two candidates, Smirnov and Smirtyukov. He said he represents the bloc of Russian communists.

Vasilyev from Tolyatti recommends Fedorov, who has fought in Vietnam. Rybkin from Volgograd Oblast recommends Ikonikov. Korovnikov, from Zagorsk, wearing internal troops uniform, recommends Stepashin from Leningrad as a Supreme Soviet deputy.

At 1445 GMT the relay from the RSFSR Congress is interrupted. The studio announcer says the congress will resume at 1715 GMT.

More on Elections

LD1606191490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1715 GMT on 16 June resumes its recorded relay from the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At this time, the announcer says the relay of congress will end at 0255 Moscow time [2255 GMT]. Therefore some adjustments will be made to programming. A film previously scheduled will not now be shown.

At 1715 GMT reportage from the RSFSR Congress resumes, with Deputy Medvedev speaking at the rostrum about candidates he wants to nominate. He complains about discrimination against deputies who are not members of the Supreme Soviet. He says competent, literate people should be elected. He proposes Chelnokov from Moscow as a good candidate.

At 1717 GMT a deputy from Moscow puts forward Sergey Ivchenko as a candidate and gives a brief biography.

At 1718 GMT Zakharov, a delegate from Moscow, talks about the worrying situation in the Moscow group of deputies. Zakharov says he is a centrist deputy, representing common sense. Most of the candidates now being put forward are being put forward for the third time. This is no good, he says. He nominates (Druganov) and (Anatoliy Kononov). They are both centrist, and neither has been nominated before.

At 1720 GMT a deputy complains about the noise from the hall. (Skrynik) from Naberezhnyye Chelny nominates a certain Yuriy Repin and recommends him. (Yeroshkin) from Kuybyshev Oblast recommends Aleksandrov.

At 1723 GMT Yeltsin reminds deputies of the procedures for accepting nominations. A previous speaker in fact nominated himself. Pavel Medvedev says he is being put forward for the third time. In view of there being so many Medvedevs, he gives a bit of biographical detail about himself, to avoid confusion.

At 1726 GMT Yeltsin says he will accept a last nomination. A deputy criticizes a previous speaker who compared Travkin with Sakharov. This is not on, he says. He doesn't nominate anyone in the end.

Yeltsin reads the list of candidates who have been nominated for the Soviet of the Republic. There are more nominations than seats available. Subsequently, he reads the list of candidates for the Soviet of Nationalities. Yeltsin asks if there are any withdrawals. Plotnikov from Kostroma comes forward to withdraw, because there are three candidates contesting one seat allocated to Kostroma Oblast. He calls on deputies to vote for Litvinov, who will have the backing of voters in Kostroma Oblast. There are no further withdraals.

At 1731 GMT (Zadonskiy) from Moscow comes forward and makes a point about the nominations.

Yeltsin waits to see if there are any more withdrawals. Chelnokov from Moscow comes forward and says he is willing to withdraw if others do so too. Yeltsin decides that Chelnokov has not really withdrawn. A deputy comes forward and says the minority in the Leningrad group of deputies really represent the people. Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether to cease the nominations. The vote is 835 for and 20 against. The tellers commission can start work.

At 1738 GMT Yeltsin says the post of deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet is still vacant. He recommends Sergey Shakhray describing him as a forthright, young man who speaks his mind. Shakhray is not a yesman. I urge you to vote for him, Yeltsin says. He wants this question settled. The tellers commission should include Shakhray in the list. A vote is taken on whether this should be done. The vote is 660 for and 188 against.

Isayev Speaks

LD1606195190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1742 GMT on 16 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At this time, Yeltsin says the question of the constitution commission has not yet been settled. He reads a list of people who he says should belong to the constituton commission and names the posts they hold. There are 14 names in all. He calls for a vote on whether these 14 should be included in the constitution commission. The vote is 601 for and 225 against. The full membership of the commission has now been chosen. It will start work immediately.

At 1746 GMT Yeltsin turns to the next item on the agenda, changes and amendments to the RSFSR Constitution. A report is to be delivered by Boris Isayev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. He has 15 minutes to present his speech.

At 1747 GMT Isayev begins to speak. He says: in its platform for the 28th congress, the CPSU says it has abandoned its claim to the leading role in society. An amendment is needed to the RSFSR Constitution saying that citizens have the right to set up their own groups and parties. There has to be an amendment legalizing alternative forms of ownership, including private property. The state will allow various forms of ownership. The republic will only be able to provide itself with sufficient food if various forms of ownership are allowed in the countryside. Isayev lists the various kinds of ownership which must be allowed. There will be an amendment specifying that is understood by "state property." All this will create a socialist market and promote economic reform.

At 1753 GMT Isayev explains proposed changes to the election and voting system and procedures. The constitutional commission will have to assess the pros and cons of the last election campaign. In the future, the congress should not meet less than once a year, he says.

The Russian Academy of Sciences will have the right to initiate legislation, Isayev says. The Constitution will be amended to say that the Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet will have the right to attend meetings of the Council of the Federation. The Law on the Supervision of the Constitution will determine the powers of the Constitutional Supervision Committee. Articles 113 and 115 of the Constitution must be made more precise, says Isayev, who concludes his speech at 1759 GMT.

At 1800 GMT Yeltsin says 55 people wish to ask questions. He suggests that some sort of timeframe ought to be agreed upon here and proposes two hours. Voting then takes place: 630 for, 178 against, 12 abstain. We have 10 minutes for speeches, says Yeltsin but if we confine ourselves to five minutes, more people will be able to speak. Voting on this takes place: 640 for, 78 against.

At 1805 GMT Bezrukov begins to speak. The declaration of RSFSR's sovereignty must be looked into to see if it can help us make amendments to our Constitution. According to the Constitution, our declaraiton would have no validity. We must change the Constitution appropriately. Article 6 of the Constitution should be made to be in line with point 12 of our declaration which discusses the political system. The Article of Constitutional Supervision must, likewise, be amended. Personally, I am against having such a body, says Bezrukov—the Republican Supreme Court could take on this function. As for the state flag—let us investigate this issue after the constitutional commission has looked into it. The third issue of 'Rodina' describes the three-colored flag, but it is not a Tsarist flag. A nationwide referendum should resolve this issue, says Bezrukov.

At 1810 GMT Shabat agrees with the preivous speaker. The Law on Constitutional Amendments is obsolete even before we pass it and I do not think we will pass it today, he says. As for amendments to Articles 6 and 7, these can be replaced by our declaration. All constitutional provisions which contradict our declaration ought to be repealed. The Constitution ought to be fully in keeping with the declaration. As for Article 76 about USSR laws being binding in the RSFSR, it ought to be amended to read: If they do not contradict RSFSR laws. As for the party, it is guilty of genocide and should be tried. Our declaration says all parties are equal, says Shabat.

At 1815 GMT Khamzin says it is essential to adopt a new Constitution. It is certain that all other republics will do likewise. Article 6 must be amended, because it is certain that there will be a new Russian Communist Party.

Constitutional Changes Debated

LD1606214590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1818 GMT on 16 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At this time, Kachanov says the Constitution is obsolete. He proposes a new preamble to the Constitution which boils down to people yielding a proportion of their personal freedom for the sake of collective freedom. As for the Russian Federation's place in the new federation, the Treaty of the Union will settle it and the Constitution ought to reflect it, says Kachanov. He proposes changes to the economy—the law on amendments is deficient and vague in this respect. He criticizes the law on amendments further, and Yeltsin reminds him he has run out of time.

At 1825 GMT Grachev, head of the Secretariat, reports on what happened concerning various procedural matters, who responded to whom, how many requests and questions have been dealt with or left unanswered. He reads out the latest questions which are now in hand. He reads out announcements where various passes can be obtained, says Glazunov's exhibition is open, and tells everyone about the opening hours.

At 1830 GMT Yeltsin says heads of departments who fail to respond to deputies' questions are breaking the law. Let us not have a situation where we shall have to ask them to come here to account for their actions, says he.

At 1831 GMT deputies are given the mike to announce where various meetings are held.

At 1835 GMT Tekhlerov says the declaration of sovereignty must be reflected in the changed RSFSR Constitution. But let us not be overly hasty, he says. Legal, social, economic expertise is required, a new treaty of the Union is in the offing, the destiny of the whole Union is here at stake. The congress should not be empowered to appoint the RSFSR Procurator. Our laws should be in keeping with those in force elsewhere. The procurator ought to be able, by law, to defend people agaisnt nationalist, chauvinist, and departmental encroachments, says Tekhlerov. The republican procurator is powerless to deal with all-Union departments. This fragmentation of procuracy plays into the hands of the criminal mafia only.

At 1840 GMT Boriskin says the Constitution must be amended—we must agree these amendments and their timeframes. Article 6 says the Communist Party is the leading force and it should simply read that all public organizations are equal. Other amendments are economic in nature.

At 1845 GMT Mityukov begins to speak. The draft law on amendments does not reflect all amendments that can be made, he says. The Russian Federation's treaties with other republics and our declaration of sovereignty ought to be reflected in the Constitution. Autonomous oblasts and okrugs (national district) should have a right to their territories. The interrelationship between the laws of the USSR and RSFSR ought to be revised, taking new realities into account. USSR laws must be suspended if they contradict RSFSR laws. If the RSFSR procurator is appointed by the USSR Procurator, the congress should be able to approve or disapprove of this. The presidium has all my proposals in written form, says Mityukov.

At 1855 GMT Zhiltsov says Articles 2, 6, and 7 are wholly out of sinc with reality and the requirements of the time. He proposes titles of various sections of the new Constitution. National sovereignty must be seen as the only source of legitimacy of people's power. This power must be exercised by the soviets. The decision making process must be as democratic as possible, says Zhiltsov.

Amendments Discussed

LD1606221790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1900 GMT on 16 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

At this time, (Turusin) begins to speak about one of the small nationalities living in Irkutsk Oblast. He proposes an amendment, providing for a quota of representation in oblast Soviets so that such nationalities can be represented.

At 1902 Rumyantsev begins to speak. He says that the draft amendments were prepared over a month ago. Now we are being asked to approve them. Since then we have adopted the declaration on sovereignty which has created a new situation. Russia has had four Constitutions over the last 70 years, but there has been only one RSFSR. Now a new and genuinely independent republic is being created. Therefore, a fundamentally new Constitution is needed, not an amended Constitution. Rumyantsev recommends the creation of a constitutional commission to draw up a new Constitution by 1991. He says he belongs to the Democratic Russia group. He lists six important principles to be enshrined in the Constitution. If the constitution commission is instructed to draw up a new Constitution, this will consolidate the republic's sovereignty. Rumyantsev criticizes certain points in the draft which has been proposed. Yeltsin warns Rumyantsev that his time has expired. Rumyantsev calls for a joint commission of the two chambers.

At 1908 GMT (Kozhokin) comes to the rostrum and says the country is going over to a regulated market economy. The constitution should provide the legal framework for this transition. The present amendments do not do this. He talks about Spain which used to have a rigid centralized system. The Spanish constitution was eventually amended to allow for demonopolization. We need to do the same, Kozhokin says. We also need a law on employees and a law on jointstock companies.

At 1912 GMT Pimenov, a non-party deputy, comes to the rostrum and says he is also speaking on behalf of the Komi group of deputies. He says the proposed amendments should be adopted without delay. They are not perfect but they are better than nothing. He says the present Russian Constitution is obsolete and outdated. He says that any autonomous republic within the RSFSR is in the same position as the RSFSR itself in relation to the central Union. Other areas which do not have formal autonomous status are in an even worse situation. He advocates the revival of the Zemstvo system of Tsarist times. This would give the regions proper representation. He says the right to self-management must be spelled out in the Constitution. He adds that people have to get used to words like "rent" and "commerce". We shouldn't fear the consequences, he says. He insists that there must be a mechanism to protect systems from injustices perpetrated by executive authorities. Yeltsin tells the speaker that his time has run out.

At 1918 GMT Luchinskiy comes to the rostrum. He says the declaration on sovereignty has affirmed the supremacy of Russian laws over those of the Union. He criticizes Gorbachev's actions towards Union republics. He says the new government should be able to make decisions on whether to close the taps on pipelines crossing Russian territory. We need an alternative to the present leadership of the CPSU, he says. He says he is proposing amendments which will apply until a totally new Constitution is drafted. He criticizes the dispatch of paratroopers to Lithuania to enforce CPSU policy there. He calls for the nationalization of CPSU assets on Russian territory. He advocates this as a member of the CPSU, he says.

At 1924 GMT Deputy Chelnokov from Moscow comes to the rostrum. He continues the themes started by Luchinskiy. He notes that Article 6 should be kept in the Russian Constitution but it should be reworded. No party should be allowed to claim a monopoly. All parties should operate within the Constitution. The deputy scorns the monopoly of the Communist Party—or rather a small group within it. He reminds his listeners that some of the communist parties in Eastern Europe have already been dissolved. He suggests an amendment to Article 32, which talks about the equality of citizens. He says in fact citizens are not equal. Party members have an advantage. The article should be reworded to stipulate that all citizens are equal regardless of which party they belong to. Chelnokov says referenda have never been held in the Soviet Union, despite the tragic periods of history during which the people should have been consulted. He suggests that provision should be made for the holding of referenda. He suggests that the role and place of the CPSU in the country should be put to a referendum.

Isayev Answers Questions

LD1606225390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1930 GMT on 16 June carries its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin. A deputy comes to the podium and says that the proposed amendments are very incomplete. More needs to be done, otherwise the RSFSR Constitution will be no different from the Soviet Constitution. A new list of amendments needs to be drawn up. The preamble to the present draft should be withdrawn. The Constitution must be completely "deideologized", he says. The RSFSR Constituton must give all groups and movements an equal chance to take part in political life.

At 1936 GMT Yeltsin asks whether they want to wind up the debate and calls for a vote. The motion is passed by 743 for and 75 against. The debate is concluded. It is announced that Isayev, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, will now answer questions.

At 1938 GMT Isayev answers a question from Zhiltsov on who drew up the amendments proposed to the Constitution. He then answers a question from Tyurkin on the references to property and ownership. Deputy (Kaufman) asks a question about the Committee of Constitutional Supervision. Belonogov asks about the wording of one proposed amendment on the private holdings of peasants. Kim asks about Article 6 and its wording. Isayev says the wording has been made to correspond with the wording of the Soviet Constitution.

At 1941 GMT there are no more questions for Isayev. He praises the suggestions made by the 23 deputies who have spoken. He says that many of them would improve the Constitution. He admits that the present amendments do not make such contribution to implementing the declaration of sovereignty. Nevertheless, he suggests that the bill as a whole be adopted, despite its imperfections. He suggests a decision be passed suspending Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution.

Isayev says that Article 76, about which many deputies have spoken, does not accord with the declaration of sovereignty. Article 76 says that Soviet laws are applicable on the territory of the RSFSR. He says he feels that there are doubts about Article 76. A deputy speaking from the floor, suggests that laws of the Soviet Union should only be applicable on RSFSR territory if they are approved by the Russian Supreme Soviet.

At 1948 GMT Krasavchenko continues speaking about Article 76.

At 1950 GMT Yeltsin reads out proposed amendments. Volkov agrees that Yeltsin is right when he suggests that Article 6 should be suspended. As for Article 7, suspension will be correct if we accept its version as set out in the draft of the presidium. Volkov suggests Article 7 should be accepted in its form as proposed by the presidium. Tiberev says Articles 6 and 7 should be replaced by the presidium's draft—the same goes for Article 49. Another deputy agrees. All deputies now speak from the floor. Slobodkin says amendments must be forwarded to the constitutional commission to be thought through. Slobodkin rejects attacks on CPSU. Yeltsin says he rejects his charge that the presidium compiles lists of those who will take the floor in a selective and tendentious manner.

At 1958 GMT Yeltsin says as time is running out, there is a proposal to halt the debate. He asks who is in favor? 748 are in favor; 46 against; nine abstentions. The motion is approved. There are now some questions on which I would like a vote: draft amendments to the RSFSR Constitution.

At 2000 GMT deputies say they want discussion of the draft changes to articles of the Russian Constitution to proceed article by article.

At 2001 GMT Yeltsin puts this motion to the vote, though he says it will take forever: 544 in favor, 268 against, and 27 abstentions.

At 2003 GMT Deputy Kuznetsov says the draft must be examined first as a whole—as a basis on which to work—then article by article.

At 2004 GMT this is put to vote: 440 in favor; 333 against; 25 abstentions. The motion is defeated.

At 2005 GMT Yeltsin puts forward another motion: to suspend Article 6 of the RSFSR Constitution and send all proposed amendments to the consitutional commission.

At 2008 GMT there is a vote on whether to have a named vote.

At 2010 GMT a named vote on suspension of Article 6 is taken: 483 in favor, 329 against; 43 abstentions. It is not passed, since two thirds majority is required.

At 2012 GMT an unidentified deputy calls for amendments to be referred to the constitutional committee. That said, we must take a firm stance now on Article 6. Yeltsin says discussion will be continued after the break.

At 2013 GMT chairman of the tellers' commission takes the stand to call for deputies to cast their votes in the Georgiyevskiy Hall. Half an hour is required.

Articles 6, 7 Debated

LD1606230490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2015 GMT on 16 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin. The evening session opens. Yeltsin says that, although it is an emotive issue that is under discussion, deputies must still keep a check on their emotions.

At 2017 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies to refer to Article 6 and suggests new wording. A two thirds majority is required for this, since it affects the Constitution. He asks who is in favor of this new wording for Article 6? The vote: 646 in favor; 40 against; 14 abstentions. Just at the end a number of deputies come in, so Yeltsin says there will be a revote. Meanwhile Deputy Smolin puts forward a "similar" but slightly different wording which, he believes, would gain the necessary two thirds majority.

At 2022 GMT Yeltsin reads out the first line of the proposed amendment, which removes the words "Communist Party of the Soviet Union" and substitutes the words "political parties".

At 2024 GMT, Yeltsin calls for a vote on this. Deputies call for registration, and it is pointed out that the 40 members of the tellers' commission will be along in a minute.

At 2026 GMT a deputy points out that Yelsin wants this couched as a decision or resolution, but since it affects the Constitution, it should be a draft law.

At 2029 GMT registration is called for: 830 are present, therefore there is a quorum.

At 2030 GMT Deputy Raskazov proposes a "small amendment" to the wording of Article 6 to ensure equality of rights.

At 2031 GMT Yeltsin again reads out his new wording and calls for a vote on this. Then there will be a vote on the amendment. Voting: 798 in favor; 32 against; 17 abstentions.

At 2033 GMT there is a vote on the wording "with equal rights"—the amendment proposed at 2030 GMT. The deputy now withdraws his amendment.

At 2034 GMT discussion moves on now to Article 7.

At 2035 GMT a decision is made by 846 to 13, adopting changes to the RSFSR Constitution, to Articles 6 and 7. Yeltsin reads out the amendments, to Articles 6 and 7 and calls for a separate vote on the law itself. This is also passed by 851 to four. So the law is adopted. Now Yeltsin proposes a decision of the RSFSR bringing the law into force, which will allow deputies to make further suggestions to the constitutional commission. He calls for a vote on this. The vote is 882 for and five against. The decision is adopted.

At 2038 GMT a deputy says he agrees with the decision in principle, but he says that a large group of deputies from the territories are being virtually barred from taking part in the business of the Supreme Soviet. He says over 700 deputies are unable to take part in the work of committees of the Supreme Soviet. Commissions should be joint commissions of the two chambers, he says.

Yeltsin asks whether or not this topic should be discussed. Deputy Luchinskiy from Leningrad calls for an open debate on this question which must be resolved. Otherwise there will not be fully-fledged commissions and committees. Deputy Dunayev from Kaliningrad comes to the podium and says that the existance of two chambers will be an anachronism so long as commissions are not joint commissions. Why are we forgetting about the priority of people's deputies and talking all the time about priority of chambers?

He says a quarter of all deputies are dominating business, turning other deputies into second-rate ones. He denounces suggestions that territorial deputies should be seated in the balcony and not in the body of the hall. He proposes that membership of Supreme Soviet commissions should be decided locally, while the leaders of the commissions would be chosen by the congress. He calls for a vote on this. Russia's problems cannot be solved unless all the republic's deputies are engaged in the process.

At 2045 GMT Yeltsin says this question has not been approved for discussion yet. The question is whether or not Article 116 should be discussed, the article dealing with commissions of the Supreme Soviet. Yeltsin suggests the word "joint" should be included in the draft.

An unidentified deputy talks about a proposed amendment to Article 107. He says this question must be discussed. (Nosovets) from Omsk returns again to the question of segregating or not segregating members and non-members of the Supreme Soviet. He takes issue with Yeltsin on the word "joint." Yeltsin talks him down. Yeltsin puts to a vote the question of whether or not Article 116 should be discussed. The figures are 441 for and 426 against, and 16 abstentions. The debate is ended. Now Yeltsin calls a vote on whether the word "joint" should be inserted in Article 116, thus making the commissions joint ones of the two chambers, but also including other RSFSR deputies who are not members of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The vote is 709 for and 145 against. This is greeted with much applause and cheering.

Control Committee Viewed

LD1606230590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2054 GMT on 16 June continues its recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin, with Yeltsin calling for a vote on whether Article 107 should be debated or not. He reminds deputies that the congress does not want to debate the entire Constitution. The vote is 317 for and 499 against. Discussion of Article 107 is ended. Another vote is taken on the article and adopted with 723 for and 75 against.

At 2057 GMT a deputy reiterates that all deputies must be given a chance to take part in Supreme Soviet business, whether or not they are members of the

Supreme Soviet or not. The import of the decisions taken today is that commissions will now be joint ones.

At 2058 GMT Deputy Alekseyev from Leningrad says that commissions should start their business before the congress completes its work. Yeltsin says the Supreme Soviet has already decided to take a rest and to resume its work on 25 June. Lovkin, from Bryansk, makes a point about the commissions. Yeltsin says there should be no conflict or confrontation between the chambers. Khasbulatov says the question of the commissions will be settled, either before the congress or during the first few days of its next meeting. Yeltsin puts the question of whether the Supreme Soviet should resume its business on 25 June to a vote. The figures are not shown, but the motion is passed.

At 2103 GMT a vote is taken to halt debate on these questions. The figures are not given, but the motion is passed.

At 2106 GMT Yeltsin moves on to the next item on the agenda, the question of People's Control, whether the People's Control Committee should be retained in the RSFSR. He suggests 30 minutes of debate on this question. Deputy Anishev, chairman of the RSFSR People's Control Committee, comes to the microphone and is given five minutes to discuss this agenda item. He makes a statement, saying that a document put about this morning in the name of the People's Control Committee was not genuine. He says the committee, the way it is organized at present, is suppressing initiative. The republic needs a new control body that is answerable to parliament. He cites the example of France, which has such a body, he says. He says that he has not been chairman of the People's Control Committee for long. The committee is not working right, but there is a need for some kind of control, and suggests that a new body be set up. He says the new body could be the RSFSR State Control Committee. He goes on to suggest a possible wording of an amendment dealing with this. The present complement of the People's Control Committee can be substantially reduced, he says. He quotes form Gertsen, to back up his arguments. The sovereign rights of the republic cannot be guaranteed without control, he says. After all, the republic's resources up to now have been used wastefully and to the detriment of the people. He hands to the presidium an outline plan for a new control body.

At 2115 GMT Yeltsin says that 30 minutes have been allocated for debate on this issue. Deputy Babkin comes to the microphone to discuss the question of control. He says people's control has not meant control by the people. It has been a mechanism defending the existence of the administration-by-command system, implementing decisions by the CPSU. The People's Control Committee is answerable to the USSR Council of Ministers, which means that the Soviet Government controls itself in practice. The committee duplicates the functions of many bodies, including the police and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. This is at a time when we are trying to cut down on bureaucracy. There is no appeal against the committee's decisions, except to the committee itself. Things are not done like this anywhere else in the world. Soviet laws should be subject to control only by the judiciary. The republics' sovereignty is infringed upon when the People's Control Committee has a say in what goes on in their territories. He suggest building kindergartens in remembrance of the People's Control Committee. The money, R50 million, which used to be spent on the People's Control Committee would pay for the building of these kindergartens. He proposes the abolition of the RSFSR People's Control Committee.

At 2122 GMT Deputy Romanov calls for a balanced, level-headed debate on the question of control. He says that the argument that a market economy does not need control bodies is mistaken. He says that other market economies have control systems, operating at enterprise and other levels. There are special organs of parliamentary control in all the democratic countries. When the country goes over to a market economy, the need for control will be even greater. He talks about the vices that will need to be dealt with when the country goes over to a market economy. There will be distortions in the system of cooperatives. We cannot relax control, he says. Control bodies are an inalienable part of people's power.

At 2127 GMT Deputy Simonov, from Khakassia, says people are beginning to think that their deputies cannot decide anything. Maybe things were better under Stalin, he says. We must decide practical questions. We must show the people that we can do something useful, he adds. He talks about the degradation in Khakassia, where nothing has changed for 50 years. He criticizes the anti-alcohol drive. We must make specific decisions. He says the People's Control Committee must be abolished. He is unequivocally in favor of this. The committee's budget can be used in other ways. He says a new parliamentary commission for people's control will work no better than the present body. The people will be impressed if we can tell them that we have released more than R50 million, which has been wasted up to now.

More on Control Committee

LD1606231790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2132 GMT on 16 June continues its recorded relay of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies session in the Moscow Kremlin.

Deputy Atlasov says he wishes to put forward a slightly different point of view. He suggest keeping the Committee of People's Control. This suggestion is greeted with jeers. Atlasov goes on: when we are going over to a market economy, we need a committee of people's control. In Voronezh, where he comes from, the Committee of People's Control is doing a good job. His views are supported by the people who elected him.

At 2134 GMT Deputy (Bir) asks whether the present committee is really doing its job properly and serving the people. Bir says it is in fact an odious structure which has been serving an authoritarian government. It is part of a system which has brought the country to the brink of collapse. It is completely discredited. Nevertheless, the country does need a new body which will keep a check on corruption. He suggests a temporary commission which will do this job for the next five or six months. He says the present committee should be abolished.

At 2137 GMT Yeltsin calls a vote on whether the debate should be terminated. The figures are 775 for and 40 against. Yeltsin reads out a proposed decision of the congress, decreeing that the continuation of the people's control system is not expedient in the RSFSR. He allows a minute's discussion on the voting procedure. A deputy insists that 30 minutes is not enough time for a proper debate on such an important question. There is no need for haste, he says. (Shestakov) says the Committee may go, but the system it represents will remain. Yeltsin says the Committee's existence is contrary to the Constitution of the republic, therefore the decision is relevant. There is no need to bring in a host of other questions as well.

At 2142 GMT Makarov suggests that the Committee should be allowed to continue for the time being, until a final decision is made by the congress. He says we have tolerated it for 70 years—let's allow enough time, at least two months, for a proper debate. Deputy Luchinskiy emphatically calls for the Committee's abolition. Deputy from Gorkiy says the old system has outlived its usefulness. Nevertheless, there is a need for reorganization rather than elimination. Deputy (Mananyev) says he is a people's controller. He has always regarded the committee as a screen. It does not protect the people's interests. He says the body is completely useless now. Its budget is R72 million for 1990. This money should be spent on housing and transport. He calls for a vote now on abolishing the committee in the RSFSR. This call is greeted with applause. Another deputy says that if the Russian people are to be regarded as loafers and thieves, then we need such a committee. He says there are too many bureaucrats with too little to do.

At 2149 GMT Yeltsin calls a vote on whether to terminate the debate on whether or not to vote on the abolition of the Committee of People's Control. The motion is passed but the figures are not given. A vote is taken on whether to vote by a show of hands. The result is 740 for and 119 against. Yeltsin reads out again the draft decision, decreeing that the system of people's control is inexpedient within the RSFSR and instructing the congress to discuss the question of setting up a new system. Deputy Yakovlev says the decision should be more specific, talking not of inexpedience but abolition.

At 2153 GMT a deputy criticizes the wording of the decision. Another deputy says that there is no need to replace one system of control with another. Tarasov from Rostov-on-Don calls for the simple abolition of the committee. Selivanov calls for a vote on the decision read out by Yeltsin. Yeltsin asks whether the two points making up the decision should be voted on separately. He calls for a vote on this. Deputy Yakovlev suggests an alternative wording, handing the committee's powers to deputies and local soviets. Yeltsin reads out the relevant clause, No. 104, in the RSFSR Constitution which refers to the appointment of the committee of people's control.

At 2200 GMT a vote taken on first version of resolution on disbanding the People's Control Committee: the result is 385 for, 438 against. A vote taken on second version—Yeltsin first reminds the chamber of the wording of this version—result is 622 for, 222 against.

At 2206 GMT Yeltsin outlines possibilities for further work on the agenda. One item is discussion of a decree on authority, that is, division of authority between party and state. He thinks this would need preparatory work by commissions but the mood of the chamber is for the subject to be discussed now. A deputy from Gorkiy suggests congress could adopt a resolution rather than a decree.

At 2210 GMT Deputy (?Varov) suggests the question be left for the next sitting of the congress, since this is a constitutional matter. A vote is taken: result is 835 for, 21 against.

At 2214 GMT Yeltsin outlines further work for the session: hearing the program of nominated chairman of Council of Ministers, endorsing appointments of RSFSR Arbiter, chairman of Supreme Court, and so forth. Some disorderly discussion follows on whether deputies should meet tomorrow.

Election Results Reported

LD1606232490

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2220 GMT on 16 June continues its recording of the RSFSR Congress of People's deputies session in the Kremlin in Moscow with Yeltsin inviting general questions. To one on the subject of new Union treaty, he refers to discussion in the Federation Council earlier this week, which he attended. Republics each were asked to nominate two representatives to attend a meeting on the subject.

At 2222 GMT a deputy from Murmansk asks a question about the mass media which leads to some confusion as the members of the presidium do not have the document to which he refers.

At 2225 GMT a deputy asks for reassurances on the decision to defer price increases. Yeltsin suggests this can be dealt with when the chairman of the Council of Ministers delivers his report.

At 2227 GMT a deputy from Udmurtia says he wants the Supreme Court chairman nominated by the congress. Yeltsin says this is for the Supreme Soviet to do. At 2229 GM, the chairman of the tellers' commission reports on results of various votes taken in the course of the day for different posts in the Supreme Soviet.

At 2237 GMT voting takes place on accepting the report by the chairman of the tellers commission. Deputy Voloshchuk has been elected to the Soviet of Nationalities by 749 to 146 votes. The report of the tellers' commission is endorsed by 743 votes to eight, with three abstentions.

At 2240 GMT Yeltsin reports that the issue of the mass media now has been included in the miscellaneous section of the agenda; 823 for, 96 against, 10 abstain. Yeltsin says one option for tomorrow is for the congress to continue, another for Supreme Soviet to work tomorrow. Voting on whether Supreme Soviet should work tomorrow: 418 for, 418 against, 15 abstain. Voting on whether the congress should work tomorrow: 470 for, 363 against, 14 abstain.

At 2246 GMT various deputies express views on what points on the agenda ought to be dealt with first. Should the congress work tomorrow, asks Yeltsin again: 525 for, 289 against, 11 abstain. So, says Yeltsin, the sitting commences tomorrow at 1000 [0600 GMT].

Further Reportage on 16 Jun Congress Proceedings

Isayev Presents Report

LD1606115890 Moscow TASS in English 1138 GMT 16 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The First Russian Federation Congress of People's Deputies resumed its work after a three-day break here today.

Lawmakers proceeded to fill the 13 vacant seats in the 252-strong Russian parliament. Despite repeated calls for consolidation and efficiency, the deputies were again carried away by the nomination process, proposing twice the necessary number of candidates.

Seven contenders were nominated for the two seats assigned to Moscow, and four Leningrad deputies will contest two seats allocated them.

The congress is yet to elect one deputy president of the parliament. President Boris Yeltsin once again nominated Sergey Shakhray, a lawyer from Moscow, for the post.

The congress accepted Yeltsin's choices for 14 additional seats in the Constitutional Commission. Yeltsin chairs the commission and his picks were mostly scientists.

The congress approved some 100 members of the commission, set up to prepare a new Russian Constitution.

However, deputies proposed changing some articles of the Constitution already at this congress.

Deputy President Boris Isyaev made a report on proposed amenaments to the constitution.

"The draft is designed to cement the renewal and improvement of the political, economic and electoral systems," Isayev said.

Political, economic and social changes in the Russian Federation require a new republican Constitution, speakers who took the floor after him said.

Several of them called for an immediate passage of amendments to the Constitution, far more radical than Isayev's proposed bill.

The majority of speakers, however, favoured the adoption of only those amendments that have already been introduced into the Soviet Constitution.

After a two-hour debate, the congress rejected the bill. The Constitutional Commission will now sum up deputies' proposals on the issue.

Constitution Amended

LD1606133790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow, 16 June (TASS)—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation today adopted, by the necessary majority vote, a law on amendments and additions to the republic's Constitution.

Article 6, which declares the CPSU to be "the guiding and directing force of Soviet society," has been amended, as have a number of clauses in Article 7. These decisions create the legal basis for the multiparty system that already exists in practice in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. In the USSR Constitution, the corresponding articles were abolished in March this year at the Third Congress of the country's People's Deputies.

Party's Leading Role Deleted

LD1606164390 Moscow TASS in English 1614 GMT 16 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitry Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 16 TASS—The First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation (RSFSR) today adopted by a majority vote the law on amendments and supplements to the republic's Constitution. Specifically, the provision proclaiming the Soviet Communist Party "the leading and guiding force of Soviet Society" has been removed from Article Six of the fundamental law. This decision provides a legal basis for a multi-party system which is actually already existing in the Russian Federation.

Then the deputies started discussing the next item on the congress' agenda—the question of people's control in the Russian Federation.

In Russia, just as in the whole of the Soviet Union, organs of people control exist at every enterprise and institution. Most speakers agreed that in its present form this structure performing the function of protecting the administrative-command system is inexpedient.

The congress adopted a decree eliminating people's control in the Russian Federation. The Constitutional Commission was instructed to draft proposals to change corresponding articles of the Russian Federation's Constitution.

The results of the elections held today were announced at the end of the meeting. Young Moscow jurist Sergey Shakhrai who, at the suggestion of head of parliament Boris Yeltsin, ran again for a vacancy as one of his deputies, has not earned the required number of votes.

Only three out of the 25 candidates were elected to vacant seats in the Russian Federation's Supreme Soviet. Not all the vacancies reserved for a number of Russian regions and the Tatar Autonomous Republic have been filled. There are two vacancies each for Moscow and Leningrad.

The results of the election show that the numerous calls of the groups of deputies to take into consideration the opinion of territorial groups, which nominated candidates, went unheeded. Just as in the first round of elections, many participants in the congress were apparently guided by group interests.

The congress will continue on Sunday, June 17.

Russian Deputy Accuses CPSU of 'Genocide'

LD1606231990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1810 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Remarks by People's Deputy Shabat of Constituency No. 37, at the 16 June session of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies in the Kremlin in Moscow—recorded]

[Excerpt] If Chapter 1 is preserved, nevertheless, I would like to draw your attention to the wholly unnatural wording of the new variant of Article 6 proposed here, which is quite simply copied from the USSR Constitution, where it says that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and other political parties, and so on, participate in drawing up the policy of the Soviet state and in governing state and public affairs.

Our declaration speaks of the equality of all parties, and it is totally unnatural to make individual mention of one certain party which, having governed our country for 72 years, is guilty of genocide against our people, and has brought us to our present situation, from which we cannot extricate ourselves. In fact, that party should he put on trial, not mentioned in the Constitution.

Thank you for your attention. [applause]

Moscow TV Relays 15 Jun Supreme Soviet Session

Voting Procedures Debated

LD1506153190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 15 June begins carrying a recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR (Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic) Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The camera shows Yeltsin on the rostrum, and delegates taking their seats. Yeltsin asks the deputies to register themselves. There are 188 deputies present. There are 51 absent. There is a quorum. The session is a joint session of the two chambers. On the agenda is the election of a chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. Yeltsin proposes three candidates. First, Yeltsin says he wants to read a statement by the RSFSR Council of Ministers, which is resigning. The statement is signed by Vlasov. Camera shows Vlasov seated amongst the deputies. Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether the statement by the RSFSR Council of Ministers should be noted. The motion is passed by 203 for, none against, and three abstentions.

At 1405 GMT Yeltsin calls for reregistration because some deputies appear not yet to have got their bearings. Yeltsin reminds deputies to leave their voting cards in the machine until the count has been completed. The count now shows that 213 are present and 26 are absent, out of a total of 239. Yeltsin repeats that he will propose three candidates for the post of premier. Each will be given 20 minutes to speak and 20 minutes to answer questions. Subsequently there will be a debate on the candidates once the transcript of their statements is available. Then a vote can be taken, either an open vote or a secret vote, using the electronic equipment, or a secret vote not using the electronic equipment.

At 1410 GMT Sevastyanov says the Soviet of Nationalities has created a commission to oversee voting. But he says that the joint session does not have such a commission available. Therefore, he says the vote should be electronic. Yeltsin says a group of deputies should be selected to oversee the electronic vote. He calls for suggestions on who these deputies should be. Various names are suggested. One deputy calls for the traditional vote with voting slips. He says some deputies are cheating by leaving their electronic voting cards behind for use by other deputies. This is the only way to explain the discrepancy between registration and voting figures. Another deputy backs this suggestion. Yeltsin says five names are needed for the commission.

At 1415 GMT two more names are suggested for the commission, one deputy withdraws his name. Yeltsin reads out five names and calls for a vote on whether they should be endorsed. The five are endorsed by 200 for, and 12 against, with four abstentions. Yeltsin now suggests that the candidates for premier should be given 30 minutes to put their case, and 20 minutes to answer questions. This is put to a vote. The suggestion is accepted by 207 for and five against, with four abstentions. Yeltsin reminds deputies of the various ways in which the vote of prime minister can be made.

At 1420 GMT an unidentified deputy says there should be a government of national trust, and calls for a vote "by name." Yeltsin interprets this to mean an electronic vote. He calls for a vote on the three methods of ballotting—open, electronic, and secret. The third option is chosen. The vote will be a conventional secret vote with voting slips, overseen by the tellers commission.

At 1425 GMT a tellers' commission is to be elected. Yeltsin invites suggestions, and asks deputies to hurry up. A deputy suggests two names. Other names are suggested and Yeltsin writes them all down. One deputy says he is suggesting that a woman be included since he believes in equal rights.

Premier Candidates Nominated

LD1506154190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1430 GMT on 15 June continues its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yeltsin says he now has 19 names and asks for a vote on these. The vote is 205 for, three against, and four abstentions. A deputy protests that some of those nominated are not members of the Supreme Soviet. Yeltsin asks which ones are not members. Another deputy says it does not matter whether they belong or not. If they are not deputies, they are more likely to be honest tellers. Sevastyanov says that some deputies have a vote, others only have a consultative role. The question should be decided once and for all, otherwise it will keep cropping up. The vote is 169 for, 38 against, and 10 abstentions in favor of only having Supreme Soviet deputies as tellers. First Deputy Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Khasbullatov is instructed to check the status of deputies nominated to the commission. Camera shows Khasbullatov on the platform.

At 1435 GMT a deputy says the question is irrelevant and no more time should be wasted on it. Yeltsin names his three candidates for premier. They are Mikhail Aleksandrovich Bocharov, Ivan Stepanovich Silayev, and Yuriy Alekskeyevich Ryzhov. Bocharov is invited to put his case for 30 minutes.

At 1440 GMT the relay is interrupted and the studio announcer says reportage will resume at 1715 GMT. World cup football coverage is about to start.

Bocharov Outlines Program

LD1506184790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1717 GMT on 15 June resumes its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At this time, Bocharov begins his speech. He says he is asking for support for a 500-day program for economic revival and transition to a market economy. During the transitional period a brake must be put on crisis phenomena. Only radical and rapid reforms can lead us out of the crisis. Initially, there must be a preliminary stage, whereby the plans are explained and resources and property are inventorized and new tax rules formulated. The second stage envisages the establishment of alternatives to state ownership. A structural reorganization of the economy will follow, during which market methods will have to be introduced and state subsidies and state pricing abolished, and at the same time there will have to be measures to deal with unemployment. There will be social protection for vulnerable categories as free prices are introduced. Land reform must center on the "sovereignty of producers." The priority task of the new government will be to help the countryside. Real earnings must be boosted, and matched by an increase in available goods. Hospital services in the RSFSR must be improved and local medical services allowed to reap the benefits of decentralization. Attention must be paid to vocational training.

Bocharov says the idea of Russian sovereignty has united deputies, and the new government must be guided in its actions by the provisions of the declaration. All administrative regions of the RSFSR must be able to benefit from a single Russian market. National regions must be given freedom of action to develop their language and culture. Illegally changed topographical names must revert to their original versions. The idea is to create a new psychological atmosphere in society. Yesterday, the USSR Supreme Soviet decided to prepare a revised economic program by September: Our own program will be ready in 30 days. The central government's program infringes on the rights of the RSFSR's industrialized cities because of the peculiarities of the distribution of goods.

At 1746 GMT Yeltsin calls for the questions. There is a discussion and vote on what procedure to adopt for the questioning of candidates. There will be 20 minutes for questions.

At 1750 GMT Deputy Trubkin asks who will be able to buy state property—individuals on salaries or members of the shadow economy. And what about the legal mechanism for implementing the program?

Bocharov replies that at the first stage, state property will be available for a symbolic price. A process of valuation will be set in motion. The details will be decided by the deputies anyway.

At 1754 GMT an unidentified deputy asks about the size of private land plots and asks other questions. Another deputy complains that each deputy should only put a single point. Yeltsin agrees.

At 1755 GMT Bocharov says the provision of plots may well be free for kolkhozniks (collective farmers)and sovkhozniks (state farmers). Local soviets should decided the size. Bocharov recounts the story of an Australian farmer of Russian origin who has asked for permission for people like him to come and help revive the Russian countryside.

At 1800 GMT Bocharov answers written questions. Is the program ahead of its time? People won't tolerate any further delay. The example of leasing shows that in a short space of time a new economic method can catch on. What's going to happen to miners under the reform program? There may be a drop in production, but look at the success of Japan and Sweden in the retraining of workers. What additional hard currency injections will there be? The republic has a wealth of natural resources which are currently going to waste. Old ships should be salvaged. Timber should be processed at home, and hard currency profits will be the greater.

At 1806 GMT Deputy Batmayev from the Kalmyk ASSR asks how education will be financed in the change-over to a market economy. Bocharov says that there are "unutilized reserves." Another deputy asks how the village intelligentsia will cope under the reform. Bocharov says that indexation will ensure that no one comes off badly.

Silayev Explains Platform

LD1506193190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1810 GMT on 15 June continues its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

RSFSR President Boris Yeltsin invites Ivan Stepanovich Silayev to explain his program. He has 30 minutes. Silayev expresses thanks for the opportunity to speak. He says he is an indigenous Russian, born in Gorkiy Oblast. He says for many years the administration-by-command system has imposed decisions on people, without giving them a chance to be involved in the decision-making. He says the solution of all the tasks facing Russia depends on the achievement of genuine sovereignty by the republic. He calls for a redistribution of legislative and executive power between the central Soviet Government and the Russian Republic.

He says any factory or enterprise on Russian territory must have the right to choose whether they wish to continue to be answerable to central Soviet authority or whether they want to go their own way. He calls for an active policy of denationalisation in order to give all the different types of ownership a chance. Private enterprise must be given an opening in the service industries and the agrarian sector. He calls for progressive taxation and more freedom for budget planners on a republican and local level.

At 1820 GMT he says producers must be motivated to keep the market supplied. He adds that there is too much money in circulation, money that bears no relation to the availability of goods to buy. He says the adoption of a market eocnomy does not automatically mean that prices must rise. He calls for indexation of prices. He says taxation is one way the state can regulate the market economy. He says state intervention must be gradually reduced. He says Gosplan and other state committees have no place in the market economy. They must adopt different, analytical roles. He says Gossnab, the State Committee for Supply, will have to go.

The republic must have full economic sovereignty over external economic relations and trade. Through a system of import licences, the republic should have a supply of hard currency at its disposal. Foreign currency earned through export sales should be kept by producers. He says Russia's economy will be sensitive to new scientific and technical developments only when incentive for this is created. He calls for the modernization of industry and agriculture, and says a target of five or six years should be set. He says Russia's problems include food, the ecology, education, and others.

At 1830 GMT he says there have been many programs in the past to tackle the problems of the agrarian sector. But none of them have worked because the "interest" factor has been ignored. He stresses the importance of building roads and providing gas and telephones in the rural areas. He hopes deserted fields and villages in the Russian Federation can be revived and resuscitated. He calls for mixed agro-industrial structures. He says that within three or four years agriculture must be given all the equipment it needs. Defense industry factories should be converted to production of agricultural equipment. Local soviets should have a greater role in resolving social problems in the villages.

He says the Russian federal system is not working. The soveriegn rights of all nations and ethnic groups living within the republic must be recognized. He calls for a redistribution of power between the republic, autonomous formations, and regions. Cultural traditions must be maintained. Russia's role in a reinvigorated Soviet federation is great.

At 1835 GMT Silayev specialists from Moscow University have taken part in drafting his program. If elected, he will present a detailed program.

At 1836 GMT Silayev concludes his address.

Silayev Answers Questions

LD1506221190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2100 GMT on 15 June resumes its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin. Yeltsin calls for attention. Silayev comes to the microphone again to answer live questions from the floor and written questions submitted by deputies.

A deputy says female teachers are very worried about their future under the market economy. What is the future of village schools, she asks. Silayev says enterprises will support schools in the future. He says he is unable at present to answer the second question, about village schools.

Silayev, answering another question, says he was born in Gorkiy Oblast, close to the border with Mordovia. He says he knows the Tatar language.

A deputy asks Silayev what his attitude is toward conversion of defense industry factories. Silayev says he does not agree with the official government policy on conversion. He says it threatens the country's defense capability.

Deputy (Rakitskiy), from Kazan, asks where Silayev will find the funds for the health and education programs he is proposing. He says profits and taxes from factories taken over from the central government will help pay for this. He says there will be a shortfall, but priority will be given to rural problems.

Deputy Kuznetsov, a teacher, says the Soviet Government should have resigned. It has let the people down and plundered them. How can a representative of that government now contest the premiership of the Russian Federation? Silayev rejects claims he has plundered his people, and makes no further comment.

Lebedev from Gornyy Altay asks a question about orders placed by the state. Silayev answers by saying that in the future, state orders should not be in the form of directives.

Isayev asks whether Silayev will resign from the premiership if the government's actions contradict Russian Supreme Soviet decisions. Silayev says he will try to modify such decisions and actions if he can. Silayev answers a written question on the budget deficit. He advocates as a solution transition to the market economy. Silayev says he believes in denationalization and private property. He has already proposed that the Kama Motor Vehicle Works become a joint stock company.

A deputy takes issue with Silayev's claim the 70-year economic experiment has failed in the Soviet Union. Silayev says he will ask economic institutions to prepare a program that considers international experience. A deputy asks why labor efficiency has fallen so low in the USSR. Silayev blames this on the previous system. He again says the "interest" factor has been ignored and cites the engineering industry as an example.

A deputy asks about the infrastructure of loss-making enterprises. If these enterprises are closed, how will people make alternative arrangements for housing and transport if such enterprises go bankrupt? Silayev says he does not believe in a policy of drastic liquidation. Another approach is needed. These questions must be studied.

Now for the last question, Yeltsin says. A deputy asks how specifically Silayev intends to create a change from the state- hired employee to the employee who is master of his own work. Silayev says he will answer this question privately.

At 2120 GMT Silayev completes his answers.

Deputies Debate Candidates

LD1506222390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2121 GMT on 15 June continues its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Yuriy Alekseyevich Ryzhov comes to rostrum. He says that, having heard the other two candidates speak, he no longer wishes to stand as a candidate. He says both candidates are worthy of the post of premier. He says he would be prepared to act as an independent expert or adviser to any future Russian government. He withdraws, and his withdrawal is greeted with applause.

At 2125 GMT Deputy Fadeyev says he used to consider Yeltsin a democrat. But now Yeltsin is insisting on one of three candidates, when 11 were agreed on at the conciliation commission. He says that all 11 should be given a chance to speak, not just the thre proposed by Yeltsin.

Fadeyev criticizes other deputies, including the previous speaker. He says the Constitution and standing orders should be followed. Another deputy says Yeltsin was elected on the basis of trust. His recommendation on the three candidates should be followed. A vote is taken on whether to continue this discussion on whether there should be more than three, now two, candidates. It is decided to move on. Yeltsin denies acting undemocratically.

At 2130 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies who wish to speak in the debate on the two remaining candidates to register. Each deputy is going to get three minutes to speak. The debate begins. One hour has been allowed for it. Deputy Andropov comes to the rostrum, saying he is speaking on behalf of the parliamentary group of workers and peasants. He says the post of premier is an extremely important one Russia's sovereignty depends on it. The position occupied by the government will be very important. He says the central government has shown that it is bankrupt. It has acted criminally toward the people. He says the central government must be unreservedly rejected. The popular masses have been infuriated by the exploitation of the working people. The "credit of trust" allowed to the central government has run out. We need new people with new ideas. Such a person is Bocharov. Bocharov is asking for 500 days. He is not asking for more. We must trust him.

At 2135 GMT Sevastyanov says the electronic system discriminates against certain deputies who wish to speak. He explains why. Yeltsin asks the commission responsible for the electronic system to look into this. Another deputy continues this discussion. The deputies should not speak in alphabetical order. Deputy Tikhomirov says the debate on Vlasov's report was done alphabetically. Nobody complained then. Yeltsin calls for a vote on whether the existing system should continue to be used. The vote is 126 for, 58 against, and eight abstentions.

At 2142 GMT Deputy Veremchuk starts comparing the two candidates for the premiership. He says Silayev's program is based on what needs to be done and where money needs to be channelled, not on where the money is going to come from, how to motivate people. This is the approach followed for 70 years. The same person when he was minister of aviation industry, presided over the collapse of the Soviet aircraft construction industry. How can we have such a person as chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers? We need radical changes. Silayev is also too old. Veremchuk says he likes Bocharov's program because it is based on research done into actual reality. The program is clearcut. Camera shows Bocharov listening to this praise. Veremchuk calls on deputies to vote for Bocharov.

At 2147 GMT Deputy Gerasimov comes to the rostrum. He praises the foreign policy successes of perestroyka. But why has the same success not been achieved in the economy? Because economic policy is still overburdened with dogma and ideology. He says Bocharov has a more specific program which will do more for the health service. Gerasimov says this as a health worker. He proposes voting for Bocharov.

At 2151 GMT Deputy Filshin says both candidates have sufficient experience. He praises Bocharov's recent work. He notes that the Russian Government must resist pressure from the center. He says Bocharov's ideas have won high regard. He calis on the deputies to vote for Bocharov. Camera shows Bocharov again.

Debates Continue

LD1606011890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2158 GMT on 15 June continues its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2158 GMT Deputy Gurevich speaks about Bocharov's candidacy and praises him as an entrepreneur.

At 2201 GMT Deputy Dobchinskiy claims that Silayev has broken his promise to give specific answers to questions and cites examples. He asks deputies to support Bocharov's candidacy.

At 2206 GMT Deputy Travkin criticizes the way work is done. He defines the distinction, as he understands it, between the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers. He says he does not think that Yeltsin should be chairman of the Council of Ministers due to the fact that the two bodies have different and separate functions.

At 2210 GMT Deputy Zakharov speaks of the necessity of deciding whether change is desired and if a totally different type of person needs to be elected. He has compared the two candidates' programs. He associates Silayev with Ryzhkov and criticizes his and the government's program because it is aimed at bringing about change at the expense of the ordinary people. Bocharov, on the other hand, wishes change to be achieved in a different and more reasonable fashion. He therefore recommends Bocharov.

At 2214 GMT Deputy (Ilenko) speaks about the crime level and shadow economy and actions which need to be taken.

At 2219 GMT Deputy Kazarov expresses support for Bocharov and praises his program.

At 2223 GMT Deputy (Izdelbayeva) criticizes the attitude towards land set out in Bocharov's program—it fails to take into account the psychology of the peasant. Silayev's program is more suitable.

At 2227 GMT Deputy Kopeyka requests that deputies attentively read the candidates' programs before they vote, because the issue to be decided is of great importance for the country. Bocharov's program seems to have aroused most interest, but Silayev's program has been discussed very little. This is, in his opinion, because Silayev's program contains nothing new.

At 2231 GMT Yeltsin asks for a vote on whether another deputy should speak: The majority vote in favor of him speaking.

At 2232 GMT an unidentified deputy criticizes Bocharov's program.

At 2237 GMT Yeltsin asks that deputies vote on ceasing discussion.

At 2238 GMT deputies make objections from the floor. First unidentified deputy continues discussion of hte programs of the two candidates. A second deputy expresses dissatisfaction with both candidates' programs, therefore discussion should be continued. Deputies vote in favor of ceasing discussion.

At 2240 GMT a tellers' commission representative takes the rostrum. He gives an account of the first sitting of the commission. Bokov was elected chairman. The commission is now ready to prepre voting lists. He describes the voting procedure to be observed during the voting.

At 2243 GMT deputies ask questions and make proposals concerning the voting procedure.

At 2244 GMT Yeltsin runs through the rules for election: at least 50 percent of the votes are required for election.

Registration is now needed in both chambers. Deputies from the Soviet of Nationalities register: 138 present, 101 absent. There is some confusion. Yeltsin asks the result to be withdrawn; everyone should register, the system will then divide people into the chambers to which they belong: Soviet of the Republic, 112 present three absent; Soviet of Nationalities, 104 present 20 absent. A quorum therefore exists.

At 2250 GMT Yeltsin declares a one-and-a-half-hour break for voting and lunch.

At 2251 GMT a recorded relay of evening session starts.

At 2252 GMT Yeltsin makes announcements.

At 2254 GMT the tellers' commission chairman enumerates results of voting: neither candidate has obtained the required majority.

At 2255 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies to register again: 191 present, 48 absent.

At 2256 GMT Yeltsin asks deputies to vote on confirming the tellers' commission protocol: 190 for, two against, five abstentions. It is confirmed.

Silayev Elected

LD1606065890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2300 GMT on 15 June continues its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

At 2300 GMT the question of changing Article 116 of the Constitution is raised by Deputy Isakov regarding formation of Supreme Soviet committees.

At 2303 GMT Isakov is questioned by other deputies. Some object to proposed change, concerned about the possible inequality between the two Supreme Soviet chambers.

At 2311 GMT discussion of proposed change continues. Some want questions to be studied by the constitutional commission.

At 2318 GMT Yeltsin proposes that the issue be postponed for further discussion at congress, after examination by constitutional commission.

At 2320 GMT Yeltsin proposes that the candidacy of Silayev be accepted, giving his reasons for wishing Silayev to be appointed chairman of RSFSR Council of Ministers, including the fact that he is much respected. He proposes that he should have some younger, more radical deputies to provide a balance.

At 2323 GMT deputies vote on whether the voting should be on the electronic system. The vast majority are in favor.

At 2329 GMT deputies vote on the candidacy of Silayev: 81 for, 17 against, three abstain from Soviet of the Republic—a similar number of votes are given by the Soviet of Nationalities, and Silayev is elected to applause.

At 2331 GMT Silayev makes acceptance speech. He states that he is not a conservative and will support those in favor of economic reform. He will serve Russia with all his capabilities.

At 2333 GMT Yeltsin reads out resolution appointing Silayev to chairmanship of RSFSR Council of Ministers and other matters relating to the Council of Ministers. Deputies vote on resolution: 195 in favor, two against, and two abstain.

At 2336 GMT Yeltsin proposes Zarubin as RSFSR arbiter.

Zarubin then makes a speech regarding the move toward a market mechanism, saying that a transitional period is necessary. He describes economic stimulants necessary to improve economy. He notes the need to protect the consumer during the switch to a market economy. He describes his view of what the RSFSR arbitration should be concerned with.

At 2344 GMT Zarubin is questioned on role of arbitration, especially as regards industry.

At 2356 GMT Zarubin states his qualifications for the position, citing his past experience.

State Arbiter Elected

LD1606101990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2356 GMT on 15 June continues its recorded relay of the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

Zarubin says that the process of introducing a state arbitration system in autonomous oblasts is already under.

Next, Deputy Muravyev for the "Smena" group says that the decision on the state arbitration committee is premature. Yeltsin replies that there has been no haste: it was on the agenda, and, apart from that, the commissions and committees will still have to examine the proposed board.

At 0002 GMT on 16 June a deputy wonders what Zarubin's "conscientiousness" amounted to in the Stalin and Khrushchev periods. Another deputy says Zarubin's replies were quite proper, and the vote should be taken.

At 0004 GMT a vote is taken: 68 for, 18 against, six abstentions for the Soviet of the Republic and 74 for, 12 against, and no abstentions for the Soviet of Nationalities. Nikolay Pavlovich Zarubin is pronounced RSFSR Chief State Arbiter. A further vote is taken to affirm the decision: 172 for, 11 against, and two abstentions.

At 0007 GMT Deputy Yaroshenko says that he has received a telegram that there are problems in Krasnoyarsk with materials and parts for harvesting equipment for Rostov Oblast.

At 0012 GMT Yeltsin asks members of the Soviet of the Republic to stay behind. The session will resume tomorrow morning.

At 0013 GMT the recorded relay concludes.

Council of Ministers Yields Power to Parliament

LD1506104290

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 15 June carries a 10-minute report by commentator Vladimir Korablev on the 15 June session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet session.

Korablev reports that the session today was opened by Boris Yeltsin who said:

"On our agenda today is the appointment of the chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. In accordance with Article 115 of the Constitution, the right to propose candidates is granted to the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Bearing in mind also the arrangement at the conciliation commission, I shall propose three candidates.

"First of all, I want to read out a statement from the RSFSR Council of Ministers on the laying aside of its powers:

"To the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.

"In accordance with Article 123 of the RSFSR Constitution, the RSFSR Council of Ministers considers its duties to have run their course and lays aside its powers before the newly elected RSFSR Supreme Soviet. The RSFSR Council of Ministers brings this statement to the notice of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic.
"[Signed] Vlasov, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

"I submit the proposal to take note of this statement by the RSFSR Council of Ministers on the laying aside of its powers before the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. I put this matter to the vote."

Korablev goes on to say that a majority of deputies voted to accept this statement. They then moved on to the question of how to vote for the candidates. They had to choose between open voting, electronic secret balloting, and secret balloting with the use of voting-papers. The latter was eventually selected. A tellers' commission was established.

Korablev reports that Yeltsin then proposed his three candidates for chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet: Bocharov, Silayev, and Ryzhov.

The report concludes with a five-minute voice excerpt from Bocharov's presentation of his program, followed by an announcement by Korablev that Silayev had also spoken and was about to answer questions.

Silayev Elected RSFSR Council Chairman

LD1506141490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—Ivan Silayev, 60, was today appointed chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. Such are the results of the second round of voting on candidates for the post of head of the republic's government, which took place today at the first session of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

TASS Reviews Silayev Election as Council Chair

LD1506160690 Moscow TASS in English 1527 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—Russia has a new prime minister. In a second round of voting here today, the first round proving inconclusive, Ivan Silayev, 60, scored a 70 percent majority in both chambers of the Russian parliament and was appointed prime minister of the Russian Federation.

He beat Mikhail Bocharov, a leader of the radical inter-regional group of deputies.

Neither of the two candidates for prime minister of the Russian Federation—Mikhail Bocharov and Ivan Silayev, won the necessary majority during the first round in today's elections.

President Boris Yeltsin took 15 minutes off for consultations and repeated the nomination of Silayev, who had won more votes in the first round than Mikhail Bocharov.

Yeltsin explained the move by citing positive features in Silayev's programme presented to the Russian parliament earlier in the day. He stressed that this programme, when finalised, could provide the basis for the activity of the republican government.

This time Silayev was supported by a majority of 163 out of the present 220 deputies.

In a brief address to the parliament, Silayev thanked deputies for their confidence and promised to prove that he was not a conservative by his deeds. "All ideas and proposals by champions of radical reform will be supported," he said.

Silayev expressed confidence that he would work in full accord with President Boris Yeltsin.

The new Russian prime minister specialised in mechanical engineering. He worked at the Gorkiy aircraft-building plant, and was promoted to deputy minister and minister of the aviation industry of the Russian Federation. He then headed the USSR Ministry of Machine-Tool and Instrument Building.

During the past five years, he has headed the Council of Minister's Bureau for Machine-Building, which coordinates the activity of four industrial ministries. He is also deputy prime minister of the Soviet Union and a member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

Further on 15 June Supreme Soviet Session

LD1506134190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The session of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet is continuing its work in Moscow. The session is being held in the Council of Ministers building on Krasnopresnensyaya embankment. Our correspondent Igor Zorin reports:

[Zorin] Hello, esteemed comrades! The struggle between the deputies of the two blocs, left and right, as they are being called here, has not enabled the chairman of the Russian Council of ministers to be chosen today. The result of the secret vote for the two candidates has just been announced. Neither Bocharov nor Silayev has won the necessary number of votes, i.e. two-thirds of the 239 elected members of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet in both chambers.

Bocharev—he was first on the list: for 86; against 134.

Silayev: for 119; against 103. [passage omitted]

What else is there to say? Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has now asked the session to take time out for 20 to 30 minutes for consultations, as he put it, in order to come up with a decision regarding new candidates or repeat candidates—I don't know what it will be—and he has instructed his First Deputy Khasbulatov to conduct the session. The first question was on behalf of 14 deputies with a request to determine the date for repeat elections to the local soviets in those areas where deputies have not been elected. The session has decided to hold them in October to November 1990. Some 191 deputies voted for this.

Article 116, part two, of the RSFSR Constitution is now being discussed. Isakov, chairman of the Soviet of the Republic, a legal professor, gave a report on this. It concerns alterations, or to be more precise, two new words are being introduced into this article. [passage omitted]

New Russian Prime Minister Meets Journalists

LD1506184490 Moscow TASS in English 1811 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Report by TASS parliamentary correspondents Lev Aksenov and Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 15 TASS—"As head of the executive authority of the Russian Federation, I am ready to implement on innovatory principles a serious programme of renewal", said Russian Federation Prime Minister Ivan Silayev. Immediately after his appointment to this post by the Russian Supreme Soviet, the new head of the republican government met a group of journalists here and answered their questions.

Speaking about the time needed to pull the republic back from the present economic crisis, the Russian prime minister pointed out that it depends on how energetically all the links act—the Supreme Soviet, the executive authorities and local governments.

"However, the programme should not take too long, certainly no more than a year and a half or two years, after which Russians should feel that the situation begins to change for the better". According to Silayev, this term will not include the implementation of the whole programme, "but there should appear signs of improvement in our society, in Russia, and I am sure they will appear."

"I am an industrialist, but I was born in the country, and I know peasant work from my own experience. Problems facing the countryside are close to my heart. Taking into account the difficult situation of the Russian villages, I shall give priority to the agrarian policy in my work. This also refers to the government I am to head," Silayev continued.

Silayev confirmed the words of the Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, that they have a "good psychological contact". "We have been working together since the 70s, when Yeltsin was head of the Sverdlovsk regional party organisation and I headed the Ministry of the Aircraft Industry".

Asked by TASS about his notion of economic relations between Russia and other union republics, Silayev said that he favoured the working out of a new union treaty as soon as possible. "Republics should agree on what functions they will keep to themselves and what they will delegate to the centre.

"These will probably include functions the realisation of which by the centre is convenient and profitable for the republics, as well as uniting functions, such as the protection of borders and major economic systems, for example transport and energy generation," he pointed out.

Silayev said he supported the exercise by the Russian Federation of "absolutely free foreign economic relations, because this problem was settled long ago throughout the world in favour of independence not only of republics, but also of individual enterprises. If so, Russia should have complete freedom of outlining its policy and choosing partners. This is its prerogative."

The appointment of Silayev to the post of head of the Russian Government is to be approved by the First Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation, which will resume its work in the Kremlin on June 16 after a short break.

Gorbachev Chairs Russian Party Meeting

LD1706113190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1028 GMT 17 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 17 Jun (TASS)—There was a meeting Saturday [16 June] chaired by Mikhail Gorbachev of the Council of Representatives of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] kray and oblast party organization delegations, who have arrived to take part in the Russian party conference which opens on 19 June. Proposals were drawn up on the agenda, working procedure, and standing orders of the conference. Certain other matters were also considered.

Taking part in the meeting were members and candidate members of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee and members of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the preparatory committee for the Russian party conference.

Further on Moscow City CPSU Meeting

LD1606002290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1745 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—Summing up the discussions at the 28th conference of the Moscow City CPSU organization which is taking place here, Yuriy Prokofyev, first secretary of the Moscow City CPSU Committee, said that it is not simply an outwardly renewed appearance of the party that is being born; its very essence is undergoing fundamental change and its radical democratization is under way. It is a difficult and painful process for the CPSU. It has taken many different directions, and for many it has stretched the thread linking them with the party to a dangerous degree of tension. Each communist and each party organization is now required not only to determine their own positions with maximum clarity and precision but also with honesty.

The conference discussed matters connected with the forthcoming organizational formation of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party. Apprehensions were voiced in connection with the possibility of strengthening separatist dispositions. The creation of a Russian Communist Party, delegates stressed, must not lead to the creation of a confederation of republican communist parties. The CPSU must remain the one force consolidating society.

The conference delegates adopted the position of the Moscow City party organization for the 28th CPSU Congress and proposals for the draft of the new party rules and approved candidacies to the central elected bodies of the CPSU and other documents.

Yeltsin Attends Leningrad Cathedral Service

LD1706193190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 17 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Correspondent Sergey Dukhavin report from Leningrad—first paragraph is announcer's introduction]

[Text] Leningrad—Aleksey II, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia, conducted a liturgy today, All Saints Day in Russia, in St. Isaac's Cathedral. Traffic was halted for several hours in the center of Leningrad because of the enormous confluence of believers who had come to hear the sermon by the head of Russian Orthodox Church.

[Dukhavin—identified by screen caption] You now are listening here in the square. [sound of church music] A divine liturgy has been held in St. Isaac's Cathedral. It was conducted by Aleksey II, patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. There have been no services in Russia's main orthodox church for more than half a century. For many years, it was one of the magnificant museums of the city in the Neva. Now, today, thousands of Leningraders and guests of the city have come here, under its vaults. And it is not only believers who have come, for many also have been attracted by the solemnity of the ceremony and the very rich decor of the cathedral, which was built to a design by Monferran. Incidentally, in our own time the state has spent more than R2.5 million on its restoration. The time is changing our lives in a headlong fashion, and for this reason, something greater than a normal church ritual was to be perceived in the flickering of the candle flames.

[Begin Yeltsin recording—no caption identification] This is a very remarkable event for Leningraders and all Russia. Therefore this event could not be disregarded. The main thing about this event is to be here during the first service by Aleksey, the new most holy patriarch of Moscow and all Russia. This is a tribute to what religion is doing for people's moral purification, for charity, and the state should work side by side with the church in the name of precisely these spiritual and moral values. [video shows exterior and interior scenes of cathedral; Yeltsin in cathedral speaking to camera] [end recording]

Western Republics

Internal Troops Called at Ukraine Prison Riot

Riots Begin 13-14 Jun

LD1506165290 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1530 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 15 Jun (TASS)—More than 1,000 prisoners carried out mass disturbances at a Dnepropetrovsk

(Soviet Ukraine) prison on the night of the 13-14 June, reports the IZVESTIYA newspaper today.

The criminals broke down the doors to several cells, and then obtained the keys and opened other rooms. Several people, having burst out into the internal yard of the gaol, carried out an escape attempt. Moreover, one prisoner was killed by the guard and another injured.

Groups of criminals began destroying the infirmary, the bath and wash house, the garage, the food store and warehouse, and other buildings. Fires started. The firemen had barely managed to cope with one blaze when another flared up somewhere else.

B. Butenko, deputy head of a section of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Directorate of Internal Affairs, stated that the convicts and those under investigation had been constantly contacting representatives of the administration, demanding improvement in prisoners' living conditions.

During the day on Thursday a number of prisoners returned to their cells. This happened after four-hour negotiations with representatives of soviet, party, and public organs, as well as with leaders of the organs of law and order of the Republic and oblast. Others, however, categorically refused to carry out the demands presented to the prisoners.

By the morning of 15 June, it had proved impossible to completely stabilize the situation in the jail, which is situated near the densely populated area of Dnepropetrovsk. Internal troops have been called in.

Hostages Held in Continuing Siege

PM1806083990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Second Edition p 8

[Own correspondent N. Mironov dispatch: "It Happened at a Remand Center"]

[Text] Dnepropetrovsk—Disturbances broke out at the Dnepropetrovsk No. 1 Remand Center.

...When the guards on duty took adults from a cell to be searched, the juveniles who remained behind began to shout out of the window that they were being beaten up and to call for help. The men in the adjoining building began to hammer on their doors and demand that the "beating" of the minors be stopped. Lieutenant Colonel of the Internal Service G. Chernechenko arrived on the scene and tried to calm down the detainees. However, they succeeded in breaking down the doors of several cells and escaping into the exercise yard. The staff on duty at the remand center were unable to quell the trouble. Some 1,000 prisoners ran riot, started fires, and took eight of the establishment's staffers hostage.

One detainee was killed and another injured while trying to break out of the center. As a result of negotiations four hostages have been released. However, a doctor, a nurse, and two controllers are still being held.

Talks With 1,000 Inmates

LD1706182390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 17 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A prisoners' riot flared up several days ago in investigative isolation block number one in the city of Dnepropetrovsk. The inmates of the block submitted to the administration claims and complaints about living conditions. as special inspector (Kazhayev) of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Internal Affairs Administration, has just told the "Vremya" program, 171 people were removed from the investigative isolation block today. About 1,000 prisoners remain and talks are being held with them.

Talks Continue With Inmates

PM1706153790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 4

[S. Troyan report: "Talks with Prisoners Continue"]

[Text] "Fires at midnight"—that was the title of the account of the mass disorders at No. 1 Remand Center in Dnepropetrovsk City published in issue No. 167 of IZVESTIYA. How are things now? Here is what Major of Internal Services S. Makarov, deputy chief of the oblast soviet executive committee Internal Affairs Administration, told your IZVESTIYA correspondent:

"Over half of the women convicts and minors have been removed from the remand center. Constant talks are being conducted with the other prisoners. People's deputies of the USSR, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and oblast and city soviets and staffers of the republic and oblast prosecutor's offices have met with inmates of the jail. Each accusation or complaint is being carefully investigated. However, new fires are constantly breaking out in the prison grounds. Nevertheless, we do not want to use force."

As of midday on 16 June, talks between the convicts and representatives of the authorities and public were continuing.

Belorussia Opposes Use of Troops in Central Asia

PM1606153190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Mikhail Shimanskiy report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet Statement"]

[Text] Minsk—The Belorussian Supreme Soviet has declared that it does not agree to the use of Belorussian militia, cadets, and servicemen of the republic's Internal Troops in eliminating the mass disorders in the Transcaucasus and Central Asia.

The document says that the shortage of militia staffers is aggravating an already serious situation in the fight against crime on Belorussian territory. The Belorussian

SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has been receiving many letters and messages from the republic's inhabitants expressing justified anxiety for the lives of their relatives and friends.

Guided by the will of the Belorussian people, the Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet demands the immediate return of internal affairs organs staffers, militia school students and cadets, as well as Internal Troops servicemen. We believe, the statement says, that henceforth they should be sent to other regions only by mutual consent between sovereign republics.

The Belorussian SSR Supreme Soviet has sent an urgent request to the USSR president, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the country's government to demand that the supreme organs of state power and administration in the Armenian SSR, Azerbaijan SSR, Kirghiz SSR, and Uzbek SSR take measures to end the violence and establish law and order on their territory by means of their own forces.

That statement has aroused a wide response in the republic and has been greeted with approval.

Crimean Deputies Propose Restoration of Autonomy

LD1706163590 Moscow TASS in English 1601 GMT 17 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Lev Ryabchikov]

[Text] Simferopol, The Crimea, June 17 TASS—A group of deputies of the Crimean Regional Council have proposed convening a Congress of People's Deputies of all levels and representatives of the Crimean population to discuss the state status of this southern region of the Ukraine.

After the 1917 socialist revolution, a Soviet Republic was proclaimed on the Crimean Peninsula. In 1921, after a civil war, a Crimean Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic within the Russian Federation was created.

In 1945, the Crimean Tatars and other ethnic groups that lived in the Crimea were accused by the Stalin government of collaborating with the Germans during World War II and deported from their homeland. The Crimean Autonomous Republic was made into a province of the Russian Federation.

In 1954, the Soviet leadership transferred the Crimea to the Ukraine.

The Crimean population now stands at 2.5 million. Of these, 70 per cent are Russians and more than 25 per cent Ukrainians. The number of Crimean Tatars returning to their homeland for permanent settlement is constantly growing.

In addition, about 10 million people from all Soviet republics visit Crimean resorts every year.

Crimean deputies say there are all grounds for restoring the peninsula's autonomy "now that historical justice is being restored in the Soviet Union".

They say it is up to the Crimean population to decide which Republic the Crimea will be part of.

However, there is opposition to the Crimea's autonomy here. The autonomy proposal will be discussed by the Crimean Council next week.

Under the law on the delimitation of powers between the Soviet Union and constituent republics, adopted by the Soviet Parliament in April, the resolution of such issues is within the joint competence of the federal and republican parliaments.

Ukrainian Republican Party Changes Rules

LD0606122590 Moscow World Service in Russian 0930 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Chronicle" feature of the "Soviet Union Day by Day" Program]

[Text] According to an INTERFAX correspondent, it has been decided at a council of the Ukrainian Republican party to introduce partial changes to some points in its rules. This was demanded by the Ukrainian Council of Ministers after the leaders of the new party submitted a claim for registration. In particular, the Council of Ministers demanded that the rules should register that the Ukrainian Republican Party would operate within the framework not just of the republic's Constitution, but also the Constitution of the Union. The Ukrainian Government also is insisting that points in the rules should be removed concerning the organization of acts of civil disobedience, as well as other clauses that are not in line with the law.

New Association for Poles Started in Belorussia

LD1606125790 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0830 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Minsk, 16 Jun (TASS)—A union of Poles was set up at an inaugural congress that took place today in the town of Grodno (western Belorussia). The new public and political organization has united Polish cultural and educational societies formed previously in various regions of the republic, and sees its purpose in developing the social activity of the Poles, satisfying their spiritual needs, propagandizing the culture, and helping all those wishing to learn the language, history, and traditions of the people.

"Having created the union," serviceman Tadeusz Gawin, head of the commission on the preparation of the congress, and chairman of the board of the "Adam Mitskevich" Grodno oblast Polish cultural and educational society, said to a TASS correspondent, "we have acquired more rights in all spheres of our activity and in establishing links with Poland and other countries, because the new organization is included into the structure of other public formations of the republic. Within the framework of the Belorussian constitution and the laws operating on its territory, we shall be able, for instance, to nominate candidates to people's deputies at all levels, issue our own publication and open educational establishments."

Delegates to the congress, representing the 420,000 Poles living in Belorussia, adopted the program and rules of the new union and elected its governing bodies. Tadeusz Gawin was elected chairman of the new organization. Delegations from Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the RSFSR, the Ukraine, and other regions of the Soviet Union, as well as from the Polish republic, led by Professor Andrzej Stelmachowski, Marshal of the Sejm, participated in the work of the congress.

Caucasus

Azerbaijan Ensures Protection on Armenian Border

LD1506163690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] The Supreme Soviet session of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] has adopted a decision on measures to ensure the security of citizens residing in the areas around the Armenian SSR. In particular, it is envisaged that the republic's Interior Ministry and KGB forces and the USSR Interior Ministry forces will reinforce protection of the facilities which are situated in the border area, and which maintain essential services and supplies to the population and to the national economy; and will block the sections of the border which are most frequently subject to attacks from the Armenian SSR.

The decision has also been adopted to ask the USSR president to take immediate measures to disarm and to disband voluntary armed formations in the Armenian SSR and to ensure public order and peace on the border between the two republics.

Azerbaijan Declares 'Emergency' on Armenian Border

PM1506154790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent Z. Kadymbekov report: "Unilaterally"]

[Text] Baku—The Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution "On Steps to Guarantee the Security of Citizens Living in Areas of the Azerbaijan SSR Bordering on the Armenian SSR."

The republic's Supreme Soviet has resolved to declare a state of emergency along the whole border until the normalization of the situation in order to suppress encroachments on Azerbaijan SSR territory and on citizens' lives, health, and property. The USSR Supreme Soviet and the country's president have been notified of this.

Georgian Ministry Urges National Military Units

LD1606224390 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2103 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The Georgian Ministry of Justice has advocated the creation of national military units [natsionalnyye voinskiye formirovaniya] within the framework of the Soviet Army.

Kirghiz Communist Party Reports on Congress

LD1606091990 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Late last night a routine congress of the Kirghiz Communist Party ended its work. Today we have received a report on its results. Here they are. The republic's Communist Party draft action program has been totally approved. It was decided to improve it, taking into consideration the results of the 28th CPSU Congress and then to present it for consideration of the republic's Communist Party plenum. The congress decided to send to the CPSU Central Committee its proposals and observations on the draft CPSU platform for the 28th congress and the draft rules.

A resolution on the interethnic conflict in Osh Oblast was adopted. The discussion of this subject at the congress was altogether fairly heated. The communists unveiled the causes of the tragedy, having emphasized that its roots lay not only in neglected socioeconomic problems and personnel irregularities but also in indifferent attitudes to people's lives and in the party and soviet bodies' lagging behind the processes taking place in society.

The Kirghiz Communist Party Central Committee Auditing Commission and delegates to the 28th CPSU congress were elected at the congress. Next a plenum of the republic's Communist Party Central Committee took place. Comrade Masaliyev has been elected first secretary of the Central Committee.

Azerbaijan Thought Defaulting on NKAO Decision

NC1506162690 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Stepanakert, 14 Jun (ARMENPRES)—Six and a half months have passed since the USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision on measures to normalize the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO]. But so far the measures remain virtually unimplemented. The representatives of the Armenian majority in the oblast are still not participating in the republican Organizational Committee. The leadership of Azerbaijan and the central organs are inclined to blame the local authorities for torpedoing this decision and thus ignoring an opportunity to normalize the situation in the region. Is that really so? ARMENPRES's correspondent put this question to Valeriy Grigoryan, chief of the party building and cadre work department of the oblast party committee apparatus.

[Grigoryan] It is easy to blame others. At the outset it was necessary to delve into the motives behind our behavior, putting aside the fact that the aforesaid decision was endorsed without the participation of the NKAO deputies who considered it incompatible with the basic interests of the Armenian people of Artsakh [NKAO]. [passage omitteed] What have we ended up with now? Blockade of the roads linking NKAO to Armenia, virtual prohibition of publication in the oblast mass media of items propagating ties with the compatriots in Armenia, absence of oblast organs of power and administration, and attempts to introduce demographic changes in the NKAO that would favor Azerbaijan. This shows that at present, the people of Artsakh are in a far worse condition then they were before February 1988.

In accordance with that decision, the republic's government organs were to take resolute and immediate measures to lift the blockade of the railways and roads. We know that the Goris-Lachin-Stepanakert road remains closed to us at the insistence of the Azerbaijani side.

[ARMENPRES] Do you mean to say that Azerbaijani side itself violates the decision?

[Grigoryan] That is the case, particularly on those points of th decision that are more or less in the interest of the Armenians of the NAKO. Here is another example: The decision binds the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium, the republic's council of ministers, and the oblast soviet executive committee of people's deputies to take the necessary measures to ensure that no demographic changes are allowed that would upset the present ethnic composition in the NKAO. However, in line with the well-known decision of the Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet Presidium, the Azerbaijani-inhabited Khodzhalu village, for example, has been promoted to a township without taking into consideration the views of the local population. Yet another point: According to the decision, the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry's internal troops stationed in the oblast are placed under the Union Monitoring and Observation Commission. However, during the March plenum of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, the first secretary of the the Communist Party Central Committee of that republic, who is now also president, A. Mutalibov, declared the following: It is necessary to propose at some point the issue of subjugating the internal troops in the NKAO to the republican Organizational Committee in order not to waste time coordinating every activity. We are witnessing the incompatibility of specific points of the agreement. [passage omitted] Besides, who is going to send representatives to the Organizational Committee when there is no oblast party committee and when the central and republican authorities have so far not recognized the oblast soviet of people's deputies and its executive committee that we have reinstated? [passage omitted]

[ARMENPRES] Despite this, is there a way to resolve the present impasse?

[Grigoryan] I am sure that is possible through mutual respect for the interests and aspirations of the two peoples. During the application of a state of emergency in the region we saw that the republic's authorities, with the military's assistance, are attempting to pressurize intellectuals, party and soviet officials, and the directors of enterprises, organizations, and establishments to abandon their activities connected with the issue raised by the people of Artaskh. It brings no honor to Azerbaijan and the center to solve the NKAO problem through oppression. That is why I think the way out of the impasse lies in mutual understanding. That will allow the search for ways to constructively exchange views. The problem should be solved through the triumph of justice; only then do the two peoples stand to gain. The Armenian side in NKAO is not short of such proposals. However, they virtually disregard us and act on the principle of "we are unaware of what you are saying, but we know you are wrong."

Yerevan Criticizes Azerbaijan About Candidates

NC1706134690 Yerevan ARMENPRES International Service in Armenian 1215 GMT 15 Jun 90

[ARMENPRES correspondent M. Margaryan report: "To the Congress From Azerbaijan, or, Payment for What Is Due"]

[Text] Yerevan 15 Jun (ARMENPRES)—The Azerbaijan Republic's party decked with its many medals—advancing toward communism in great strides, which, as the Azerbaijani leaders say, is also internationalist, and which is one of the militant vanguards of the CPSU—has elected its delegates to the 28th CPSU Congress. And they have not forgotten the old script: toadyism, transparent ploy, and flattery to curry the favor of the center. This is not a revelation, and it will become clear once the reader becomes familiar with the namelist "of the best from among the best."

The republic's party congress paid the military-party-political officials related with the problem of the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] their due. The congress was acting on socialism's principle of "to each according to his work" in giving the mandate to General Safonov, the military commandant of NKAO; Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the republic's Organizational Committee; and Dzhafarov, first secretary of Shushinskiy Rayon party committee. I almost forgot: included with these is Voyko, chief of the NKAO Department of Azerbaijan Committee for State Security. But why should N. Konarev, USSR minister of railways and a resident of Moscow, be delegated to a congress in Moscow? Probably because of the irresolution which the railway department is displaying as regards the rail blockade of disaster-stricken Armenia and NKAO and the soldering of the wheels to the tracks. This esteemed minister could have been delegated by another organization in our boundless country. But no, it is also possible to stroke the cheek of the minister gently after the railway operations have been disrupted.

V. Mikhaylov, first deputy chief of the Interethnic Relations Department of the CPSU Central Committee, also had the honor ot being elected a delegate. After all, interethnic relations in Azerbaijan have been clarified: Everyone knows who is the enemy of whom. Other Moscow officials have also been elected delegates.

Yet no delegate has been selected from the Armenian population of NKAO. The injustice has been institutionalized: Since there exists no oblast party committee there could be no oblast conference and therefore there could be no Armenian delegates.

We had not yet typed out this item when the (?television) news bulletin supplied a few unknowns. First, the USSR minister of railways has already responded to the caressing. He is not in Moscow but in Baku and from there he has given an interview to TASS that will reach the whole country—by the way, the chief-director of TASS, L. Kravchenko, is also an elected delegate to the 28th CPSU congress from Azerbaijan—in which he eulogized the Azerbaijani railroad men.

Incredible? Here are some quotes: "It is worth noting that under these difficult conditions the Azerbaijani railwaymen are conscientiously fulfilling their professional duty." That is not all. The TASS dispatch provides more amazement. E. Abdullayev, chief of the Azerbaijan Railways and always a fixture at the interview table, complemented the good-natured minister by complaining that "we are unable to spur the conscientious work of the people; almost every month we are forced to deprive them of additional award money."

The incentive fund for the Azerbaijani railroad men, who are so professional that their professional conscience allowed them to solder the wheels on the tracks, could be created from the wages not paid to the builders and workers of the industrial enterprises which remained idle for months due to the blockade of the disaster zone.

The grateful minister had not yet finished and continued with pathos: "There are forces blockading the transportation and preventing the normal functioning of the two republics' railroads. Instigated by Armenian terrorists, planned diversionary acts have been committed, freight cars have been blown up, and the train engineers have been fired upon along that section of Azerbaijan Railways which crosses the Megrinskiy Rayon of the Armenian Soviet Socilaist Republic." So there has not been a railroad blockade and destruction and pillage of freight cars in Azerbaijan for month? Here is what the well-informed minister says: "As to the credibility of what the Yerevan railroad department workers told the central mass media about alleged cases of destruction and pillage of the freight along the Azerbaijan Railways, I can only say that such claims are unfounded. In any case, I, as a minister, have no proof of it."

That is exactly what he said.

Alas! the minister is unaware of the pillage and damage of the Azerbaijan Railways for the last two years.

Yes, the minister paid quickly for the trust shown in him. Now it is the others' turn.

New Youth Organization Established in Georgia

LD0506133190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1200 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] The inaguration congress of the new organization The Young People's Union of Georgia has taken place in Tbilisi. Its governing body is the Provisional Duma. The organization's activity is based on the principles of universal human values and the declaration of human rights.

Apathy Delays Armenian Parliament's Formation

PM0506123990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by Sergey Bablumyan: "The Path To Parliament"]

[Text] Yerevan—The republic's central electoral commission has published the results of the elections to the Armenian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet.

The names of the first finalists in the electoral marathon will fill only 99 of the 259 deputy's cards. But a republican parliament capable of carrying out its duties will only be formed after repeat elections and a repeat vote. However, it is possible that they too will merely be the next stage in the election campaign.

This development cannot be described as unexpected. One of the main reasons for the situation is the refusal by a substantial section of the population to participate in the election campaign.

The voters' apathy is due to the unstable political situation in the republic and the developing multiple-authority situation which, the further it goes, is turning into anarchy and all that that entails.

One fact requires analysis: None of the Yerevan party rayon committee secretaries nominated for deputy got through at the first attempt. But their colleagues from rural rayons were far more successful.

The repeat vote is set for 3 June and the repeat elections will take place within the next two months.

Agro-Industrial Backwardness Examined in Baku

NC0506123590 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] Severe backwardness has developed in the production of various types of agricultural products since the beginning of 1990. Furthermore, the demand for discipline in various domains of the agroindustrial complex has been allowed to weaken. The party organizations have been condoning backwardness and failing to make the necessary effort to alleviate this state of affairs.

The meeting held by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee in Barda on 1 June was devoted to these problems. The leading officials of the party and economic organs and state and collective farms in the cotton farming rayons, secretaries of the primary party organizations, and experts of the republic's agroindustrial committee and its local organs participated in the convocation. Tel'man Orudzhev, secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the meeting. He outlined the central committee's policy to develop the republic's agro-industrial complex and improve the supply of provisions to the people.

Abdullayev and Mamedov, members of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, participated in the work of the meeting.

Central Asia

Continued Reportage on Violence in Kirghizia

Journalist Describes Situation

LD1606003190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2125 GMT 15 Jun 90

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Excerpt] [Presenter Aleksandr Gurnov] Over recent days we have all been following with alarm the situation in Kirghizia. Our correspondent has been there the whole time, but he has been unable to send back reports from there, first because of the poor technical facilities at the local studios, but also apparently because those who might have been able to help him were not very interested in doing so. Be that as it may, Aleksandr Goryanov is now back in Moscow, and he is with us in the studio today, filled with impressions and bearing kilometers of video recordings which he has brought back with him.

Sasha, we have today finally begun to receive reports that suggest the situation has returned to normal, that the disturbances have quietened down. Is that really how it is?

[Goryanov] First of all, good evening. [video shows group of local people of all ages clustering around the correspondent and speaking into his microphone, though their words are not heard] The situation has today come under control. Matters are a little worse in the rayon center of Gulcha, which is 60 km from Osh. Incidentally, you had a report from there in your program yesterday. Military units in Gulcha...incidentally, what you are seeing now on your screens, these are Uzbek refugees. Matters are a little worse in the rayon center of Gulcha which is 60 km from Osh. And the third place, from where up to now there has been practically no information, is Uzgen, one of the oldest towns in Central Asia. [video shows clip taken from a vehicle moving along a rough street with single-storey houses alongside, some of them damaged and burnt] On 5-6 June veritable carnage broke out on the streets of this town, and there were casualties on both sides—around 100 people were killed and hundreds of others were gravely wounded. An investigative group from the USSR Procuracy is working today in the town, and I hope that those responsible—both those now being held and those not yet arrested—will answer to the law.

[Gurnov] As I recall, the cause of the conflict in Osh was 24 hectares of land. Are the reasons just as ludicrous in other places?

[Goryanov] I think both in Osh and here in Uzgen the reasons are the same. The famous writer from Kirghizia, Chingiz Aytmatov, told us in an interview that the basic cause is the poverty of the republic's population. I would add that because of the low living standards, the level of political understanding is very low, and for this reason protests take a barbarous form. [passage omitted: Goryanov says he does not want to anticipate the findings of the investigative group. He and Gurnov hope for a solution to the crisis]

Unrest Dominates Kirghiz Congress

PM1806090390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p3

[Dispatch by own correspondent Gennadiy Shipitko under the rubric "Direct Line": "Kirghiz Communist Party Congress"]

[Text] Frunze—The 19th Kirghiz Communist Party Congress opened in the city of Frunze on 14 June in the conditions of a state of emergency. The delegates honored the memory of the 156 people killed in interethnic conflict with a minute's silence.

A report was delivered by A. Masaliyev, first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet. The 885 delegates attending the congress have to discuss the Central Committee's work and draw up a program of political and economic action for the coming period.

The speaker's efforts to once again accuse the central press of unobjective, biased coverage of the interethnic conflict in the republic drew attention. I must remind you that A. Masaliyev has made similar accusations before: at the 19th party conference and at the Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The start of the congress was marked by a vote on changing the composition of the presidium and the mandate commission. In the opinion of one of the delegates, people guilty of whipping up interethnic conflict must have no place in the leading bodies of the congress. The majority of delegates did not support this proposal, however.

This is the first time that everyone living in the republic has had the opportunity to watch a congress. It is being relayed on radio and television.

According to reports from Osh Oblast, the situation there is gradually getting back to normal and the last 24 hours have passed without incident.

Kirghiz Writer Discusses Language Issue, Uzbeks

LD1406222790 Frunze Domestic Service in Kirghiz 1215 GMT 14 Jun 90

[Speech by Chingiz Aytmatov, Kirghiz writer and member of the USSR Presidential Council, at 19th Congress of Kirghiz Communist Party in Frunze on 14 June—live or recorded]

[Excerpt] When such kinds of mass-meetings as the one in Kurultay are held, the representatives of the Uzbek people, inhabitants of Dzhalalabad, of (?Karavan and Rasul) stood on this rostrum and expressed their views in the Uzbek language. [words indistinct] the work of translation, is it that much difficult, do we lag that much behind? [word indistinct] in connection with this. I would like to say to Comrade Musaliyev, in accordance with the rules [language law] you should have delivered your speech in the Kirghiz language. [applause]

Dear Comrades. While the conception on language was introduced to the people as a law together with other well-known laws, and were confirmed, so you should have fulfilled this in practice. Comrades I can tell you that I know the Russian language very well, the Russian language will always be with us. However, people have their own spiritual (?values). All comrades who speak either in Russian or in Kirghiz know this very well. [indistinct passage omitted]

The reason why I say this is due to the fact that I am upset. It is clear to all of you that chaos came over our people. [word indistinct] death, disturbance, and political instability [words indistinct] are taking place in our [words indistinct].

Our countrymen in Osh, the Uzbeks—among them are those who want autonomy, thinking that this autonomy will solve all their problems, and improve their way of life. I understand that every nationality has its own traditions, culture, language [words indisitnct] I went to Tashkent twice (?in this month) where I met and talked with comrade Karimov, president of Uzbekistan, and comrade Mirsayidov, chairman of the Uzbek Council of Ministers, leaders from the Birlik, and the leader of the Erlik Party [Erk—Will], the party leaders of the Turkish community. I asked whether there are views for autonomy or merging with you of the Uzbeks who are residing with us? What are your aims? If you are frank, we can understand one anothers positions. All unanimously, from the president to the non-officials said they do not have such an aim. [words indistinct] [passage omitted]

Kazakh Quake Not Caused by Semipalatinsk Tests

PM1506173390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "USSR Defense Ministry Announcement"]

[Text] An earthquake took place at 1647 hours on 14 June, with its epicenter in an area 50 km north of the population center of Zaysan. The earthquake's force measured 7 to 8 points at its epicenter. Tremors measuring up to four points were recorded in Semipalatinsk, and up to four points in Novosibirsk and Frunze. According to preliminary data, there have been no casualties or destruction.

Due to the fact that rumors have been circulating among the population of areas adjoining the Semipalatinsk test range that the earthquake was the result of a nuclear test, the USSR Defense Ministry announced that no nuclear tests were planned or carried out at the Semipalatinsk range.

Kazakh Congress Addressed by Party Leaders

LD0906035190 Alma-Ata Domestic Service in Kazakh 1400 GMT 8 Jun 90

[Excerpts] An information report of the 17th Congress of the Kazakhstan Communist Party: The 17th Congress of the Kazakhstan Communist Party continued its work today. [passage omitted]

At the congress, a speech was delivered by Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The concluding speech was delivered by Comrade Nazarbayev, first secretary of the Kazakhstan CP Central Committee, in connection with the matters under discussion. The congress acknowledged the activity of the Kazakhstan Communist Party Central Committee in the period under review as satisfactory. The report-back of the Control Commission was approved. The 17th Congress of the Kazakhstan Communist Party will continue its work tomorrow.

New Electronics Plant Starts Up in Turkmenistan

PM1206084790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 6 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Newscaster] The creation of a new electronic components plant in Chardzhou is to be welcomed.

[Correspondent] It took only six months to start up a completely new production facility on the premises of an old truck depot. Reconstruction is still continuing, but consumers in many parts of the country have already received the first shipments of its output—magnetic circuits—which are needed in a great many instruments.

Recently a group of the new plant's startup engineers have returned from a duty tour at the "Zakarpatpribor" association in Uzhgorod. A new transformer coil winding production shop is to go into operation within the next few days.

The first consumer goods have also already been produced. They are being made in an ecologically absolutely clean production facility, the fourth to date, which represents a new sector—instrument building—in the region's industry.

[N.G. Chaplinskiy, chief of the instrument-building section, facing camera, identified by caption] We are also trying to attract union enterprises to our oblast. Last year, for instance, we established a clothing factory here as a subsidiary of the Zlatoust factory in Chelyabinsk Oblast. Now we are negotiating with the Penza bicycle plant to organize bicycle assembly at one of our production facilities. Together with the oblast union of consumer cooperatives we have drawn up a program for creating a large number of jobs in the production of clothing and knitwear articles, carpet weaving, and the production of various construction components, bricks, ceramics, and so forth.

In this way we are planning to increase the production of consumer goods five or six times over in the next three-to-four and produce some 50 million rubles' worth of goods while creating a large number of new jobs.

Uzbek Party Congress Convened in Tashkent

NC0506113690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] The Uzbek Communist Party Congress convened today in Tashkent with 1,561 delegates participating. The delegates represent 600,000 communists of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic.

Kerimov, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee, addressed the congress.

Uzbek Supervisory, Auditing Commission Meets

LD0906042990 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0115 GMT 7 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Information report on the plenum of the Supervisory and Auditing Commission of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan.

On 6 June took place the plenum of the supervisory and auditing commission of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan, elected by the 22nd congress of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. The plenum elected Yuldashev as chairman and member of the Presidium of the Supervisory and Auditing Commission of the Communist Party of Uzbekistan. (Aliyevich) has been elected first deputy chairman and member of the Presidium of the Supervisory and Auditing Commission. (Nagamov) has been elected deputy chairman and member of the Presidium of the Supervisory and Auditing Commission. [passage omitted]

The secretaries and members of the buro of the Uzbekistan Communist Party Central Committee and the senior officials of the CPSU Central Committee participated in the work of the plenum.

Uzbek, Kazakh Presidents Affirm Friendship Ties

LD1606085390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0749 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Tashkent, 16 Jun (TASS)—Presidents Islam Karimov of Uzbekistan and Nursultan Nazarbeyev of Kazakhstan have spoken out against a split in the CPSU and in favor of the organizational and ideological unity of the party. A meeting took place between the two leaders, who are also heads of the party organizations in their republics, in Tashkent yesterday.

In their conversation they touched on a broad range of issues concerning the further development of cooperation between the two republics. The parties to the conversation briefed each other on the results of the recently held 17th Congress of the Kazakh Communist Party and the 22d Congress of the Uzbek Communist Party, and the progress of preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress. Much attention was paid to topical problems of restructuring.

The presidents expressed confidence that the historically evolved good-neighborly relations between the peoples of Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan will continue to grow stronger and develop in a spirit of friendship and fraternity.

Need for 'Commonwealth' Seen

LD1606172690 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 16 Jun 90

From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A meeting was held in Tashkent between Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic, and Karimov, president of Uzbekistan. Our correspondent reports:

[Correspondent Ganiyevr] This is the first business meeting between the presidents of the two neighboring republics. Today, residents of this major southern region of the country are concerned with problems of market relations, of social and cultural cooperation, of ecological calamity, of the pain of interethnic conflicts, and with questions concerning party life of the two republics before the 28th CPSU Congress. All these require solution. [video shows Nazarbayev in front of building being interviewed]

[Nazarbayev] As you know from the press, what is involved is the formation by our republics of a commonwealth [rus coobshchestvo] of the two sovereign states. Our commonwealth [rus sodruzhestvo]—as we intend to sign a treaty on economic commonwealth [sodruzhestvo]—show that we are part of a single federation and of a single state. However, we must consider what is beneficial for our republics and our peoples. The republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, especially Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, are very rich in raw material which we export, unfortunately, and which we do not process here. We are the ones accused of getting all the subsidies in the bargain. That is strange. After all, those who possess raw material are never poor anywhere, and yet we are. How can this be explained?

So, the time has come to calculate everything and to make the wealth of our republic's resources serve above all the people who possess and recover them. We must do everything to make these historically mixed peoples live peacefully, improving their lives. That is what is at issue.